



Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

***Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record***

FBIS-SOV-89-169-S
Friday
1 September 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-169-S

CONTENTS

1 September 1989

NOTICE TO READERS: This is the final edition of the Daily Report's special supplement comprising the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies, including the first sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

10 June Supreme Soviet Joint Session [IZVESTIYA 12 Jun] 1

10 June Supreme Soviet Joint Session

18300700 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 2-11

["Second Sitting of the First Joint Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

10 June 1989. USSR Supreme Soviet Hall of Sessions in the Kremlin. 1000.

Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the Council of Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presiding.

Ye.M. Primakov: We have a sufficient number of deputies registered to commence our work. Today we will discuss two questions. The first is to elect the deputy chairman of the chamber. The second is to elect the chairmen of the four commissions which are to be formed in the chamber.

Last time we agreed and let us extend this agreement to the present day: 30 minutes suffices for discussing the candidacies of the deputy chairmen of the chamber. Is anyone against this? Then we will adhere to this.

As you recall, at the last session the following was announced: The deputy chairmen are to be proposed by the chairman of the Soviet of the Union. After consultations which were held with the deputies and with representatives from the republics, various social organizations, and so forth, it was proposed that Bayan Seilkhanovna Iskakova, who presently heads the therapeutic division of the Kzyltuskii Rayon Hospital in Kokchetav Oblast, and Nodar Mikhaylovich Mgaloblishvili, chairman of the board of the Georgian Union of Architects and secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Architects, be elected the deputy chairmen.

Comrades Iskakova and Mgaloblishvili will be released from their basic work and transferred to employment at the Supreme Soviet. I would like to emphasize that the position of deputy chairman of the chamber will rotate considering both the regional affiliation of one or another candidate and how each performs the job. I would like to preface our discussion with these comments. Now for the discussion. Let us start with Bayan Seilkhanovna Iskakova.

Are there any questions, comrades? I can provide the basic biographic data. Year of birth: 1957, nationality: Kazakh, education: higher. She completed the Tselinograd Medical Center, has been a CPSU member since 1983 and a USSR people's deputy. Her labor activities include: internship in the oblast hospital and then head of a rural medical outpatient clinic at the Chekhovskiy Sovkhoz and now a head of the therapeutic division of a rayon hospital. We have spoken with Bayan Seilkhanovna; she expressed a desire to work here, and she realizes that it is a question not of a symbolic presence of

one or another republic in the Presidium but rather a matter of real work. Are there any questions, please?

V.A. Tsyurupa, department head of Municipal Hospital No 15 (Veshnyakovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): In the first place, I am very pleased that my colleague has been promoted to such a high, responsible post. I would like to ask what is your opinion of the problem of insurance medicine? Briefly, what is your understanding of this problem and your attitude toward it?

B.S. Iskakova: I have a positive opinion of the question of insurance medicine and I feel that the development of insurance medicine can resolve many problems which exist today in public health.

Ye.M. Primakov: Other questions? Please.

From the floor: I would like to know how you conceive of your work as the deputy chairman? How do you see yourself in this capacity? Do you feel ready for this activity?

B.S. Iskakova: Let me first answer the second question of whether I feel ready. I asked myself this question even during the preelection campaign when I was voted in as a deputy. I already felt the responsibility which rested on my shoulders and all the possible types of work which I would have to perform as a deputy.

How do I imagine the work in the Supreme Soviet? At the last session we asked this question of Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov and studied the range of work of the chairman of the Soviet of the Union. I feel that all of this will also apply to the deputies.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there other questions? Please.

M.A. Bocharov, director of the Butovo Building Materials Combine (Sovetskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): Who proposed you for the position of deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union? And, second, for the honorable Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov: How were the commissions and the leadership of the commissions formed? Finally, when the Supreme Soviet was elected, there was a question whether both chambers would elect the members of the commissions and the leadership of the commissions. Who proposed you for this position?

Ye.M. Primakov: If possible, I can answer this. I made the proposal for this position after consultation conducted with the representatives from the republics and many deputies. Second, the idea was voiced among us that the deputy should be a rather active person. He did not need to be a specialist in administrative matters. Moreover, it was essential that the various regions of our nation be equally represented. In addition, Bayan Seilkhanovna is a woman, and this is a definite plus. Now we are stopped on this candidacy.

Now about the committees and commissions. Today we will approve the leaders of four commissions which are to be set up in our chamber. The lists that were sent out are not in any way inviolable. This is the main thing, and

for this reason I would like to state ahead of time that if questions arise on moving from one commission to another, or about additions or expulsions, we will agree in the proper manner. The main thing now is to set up these commissions and committees so that they begin working with the candidates in ministerial posts.

Are there any questions, please?

From the floor: Bayan Seilkhanovna, we still do not know you. When we do we will certainly vote unanimously. At present I would like to ask one question. Yesterday at the evening sitting there were two speeches. The penultimate was Academician Sakharov, and then one other comrade spoke, but I was not able to hear his name. What was your attitude toward the first and second speech, and how did you view them?

Ye.M. Primakov: Well, comrades, I don't know how valid these questions are. You can again, so to speak, accuse me of usurpation but it seems to me that the main thing is for us to understand who is standing in front of us and to ask questions about the functions that she will exercise.

From the floor: Please excuse me, but I have a legitimate right to ask the question. I would like to understand the method of her thinking. How does she think, how does she conceive of things? I have not stated my own opinion; I would be interested in how she thinks. Please answer my question.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

B.S. Iskakova: In the first place, my opinion is that Academician Sakharov should be given an opportunity to say what he wishes. As for the second comrade, I do not know who you mean. The one who charged that the rules had been overlooked? Well, it seems to me that he is right in terms of the fact that we during the work of the congress violated the rules very frequently—that is, we ourselves voted for the rules and then violated them.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, you have a question?

From the floor: I am very pleased that a woman and a physician has been proposed as the deputy, since I myself am a physician. I would like to ask the following question: How do you conceive of your job? What is your family status? Where will you live? That is what interests me. A second question: What is your opinion of medicine in the Soviet Union as a whole?

B.S. Iskakova: On the first question, Yevgeniy Maksimovich [Primakov] has already said that the deputy will work permanently in the Supreme Soviet if, of course, elected. This means that I must live here. My family status is unmarried.

As for the second question of what is my attitude toward public health as a whole in the Soviet Union: I feel that public health as a whole for the Soviet Union is at a very low level—that is, on the level of the 1950s.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there any other questions, comrades? Please.

D.G. Smirnov, design engineer at the KhEMA [Electromechanical Plant] Production Association, Kharkov (Kharkovskiy-Moskovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kharkov Oblast): Please tell us what you think, is it necessary—alright, this question was not raised at the congress—here, in the Supreme Soviet to provide an opportunity for a minority in voting on any question to state its opinion separately and officially?

B.S. Iskakova: I, in the first place, have not understood the question.

D.G. Smirnov: I have in mind to document the opinion of the minority and publish it in the press.

B.S. Iskakova: I see; will a guarantee be provided for the minority? I feel that the opinion of the minority must also be considered.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there other questions? Please.

From the floor: What is your attitude on the medical cooperatives?

B.S. Iskakova: I cannot say accurately as yet, but at present I feel that medical cooperatives should be employed not everywhere and not in all types of medical aid.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there any other questions? Another question? Please.

Yu.Yu. Sokolova, senior instructor at the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy (from the women's councils under the Soviet Women's Committee): Dear colleague, what problems of women in the USSR, in your view, should have priority?

B.S. Iskakova: In my preelection program the questions of protecting maternity and childhood were given a major place. Because this is within the functions of not only the Soviet Women's Committee, but particularly the public health workers, as you yourself understand, I feel that at present there is great work for us to do on the question of protecting maternity. I agree fully with those provisions and points which the Soviet Women's Committee has put forward in its preelection program.

Ye.M. Primakov: A question? Please.

From the floor: Our nation is presently experiencing a shortage of medicines. How do you feel that this situation can be rectified?

B.S. Iskakova: I feel that this situation not only can but must be rectified. We will seek a way out of this situation together with you, working on the Committee for Protecting the Health of the Public.

V.I. Kisin, chief of the I.A. Likhachev Administration for New Equipment at the Moscow Motor Vehicle Plant (from the All-Union Znaniye [Knowledge] Society): You

have assessed the level of public health as not sufficiently high, if I correctly understand. In deciding the question of the position of minister of public health, what would be your principles and your criteria for working in this post?

B.S. Iskakova: It seems to me that for this we should first hear the minister of public health and then judge.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there any other questions, comrades?

L.I. Sukhov, motor vehicle driver from the Kharkov Motor Transport Enterprise No 16301, Kharkov (Kharkovskiy-Leninskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kharkov Oblast): Please tell us, I was listening to the arguments concerning your promotion. They were very weak. The only thing that you have for your recommendation is an active stance at the congress. Just what does this mean?

B.S. Iskakova: In my opinion, nothing was said at the congress about my active stance.

Ye.M. Primakov: Not at the congress, but generally an active stance.

B.S. Iskakova: In my opinion, it was a question of an active stance in life, that is how I understood it.

From the floor: I feel at the congress....

B.S. Iskakova: At the congress it was not possible to ascertain an activist stance in all the deputies.

Ye.M. Primakov: Well, comrades, let us consult a bit. It seems to me that we will proceed correctly if we now vote. In the process of the work positive qualities have turned up and, possibly, certain shortcomings in the work of each. Do you insist on further discussion?

From the floor: Yes, I insist on a discussion.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, if you want to say something, do so.

A.A. Sobchak, head of the chair at the Legal Faculty of Leningrad State University, Leningrad (Vasileostrovskiy Territorial Electoral District): I would like to say that the candidacy which we are now discussing is extremely important to our future activities. For this reason I would like us from the very outset, in discussing also the subsequent candidates for the committee and commission chairmen, to follow a path of alternative discussion. I feel that the candidacy proposed for us, with all the fine personal qualities, does not sufficiently meet the high demands that are placed on the post of the deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union. This includes a lack of the necessary work experience, as well as a rather narrow vocational education. I feel that this post should be held by a person who has a humanities education and sufficient experience in sociopolitical activities. The candidacy proposed for us still lacks certain clear political positions and views. For this reason I fear greatly

that in the event of an election, we will obtain a deputy chairman who will be very pliable.

In this regard, I would like to propose as an alternate candidate to this post the candidacy of the well-known economist and active political figure, Professor Kazimer Danute Prano Prunskene, rector of the Institute for the Advanced Training of National Economic Specialists Under the Lithuanian Council of Ministers. I feel that in terms of her professional qualities and her political stance, Comrade Prunskene fits this role much better. And as a woman this is also good.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, I naturally have nothing against this. On the contrary, I support certain alternative solutions to this question. But I would like to state the following. In the Soviet of Nationalities, the Baltic will be represented. We must see to it that the representation from the republics is more or less evenly maintained, and in the rotation we must also work for this. I also have very high regard for Comrade Prunskene and would be very happy if she held this post. When Comrade Iskakova was proposed for this post, the designated aspect of the question was taken into account. I agree with you that this person should not be a bland figure but naturally an active worker with clearly expressed views. In the preliminary long conversation which I have with Bayan Seilkhanovna, I spoke with her on many questions, and, believe me, she is a rather progressive person and generally understands the necessity of running things in a progressive direction. For this reason I would very strongly request that this candidacy be supported. Please.

From the floor: As far as I have understood the previous speaker, he is not against supporting Iskakova. But, possibly, we should also hear Prunskene, ask her questions and then decide for whom we will vote. That is my opinion. Then this would mean there would be a choice.

From the floor: I have a question for the chairman of the chamber.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, is there some other proposal?

From the floor: Is it possible to ask a question?

Ye.M. Primakov: Just a moment, I have already given the floor to someone.

V.D. Yudin, chief of the Central Geochemical Party of the Central Geophysical Expedition, Northeastern Production Geochemical Association, Khasyn (Magadan Territorial Electoral District, Magadan Oblast): Before discussing and making a decision on the candidacies for the deputy chairman, I would like to clear up a question concerning rotation in this position. At present, we are discussing the selection of a candidate who is inexperienced in this work, and if the given person knows that in 6 months possibly the question will arise of replacing him at the next congress, this will not make him confident in his work. Generally, this will not provide an

opportunity to acquire experience. It seems to me we should make clear that rotation is not an aim in itself. We must guarantee a person a period of time. I feel this should be at least 2 years. Certainly in such a position within a year a person is just mastering all the details of work; it is after this that his activities should be judged. Then the candidates will feel more confident on this rostrum, not like persons temporarily fulfilling duties.

Ye.M. Primakov: I can say that I agree fully with you. Please. Now the floor is yours.

R.A. Medvedev, writer, Moscow (Voroshilovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): I would like to raise the question of the procedure for running the meeting. Comrades, we are beginning to behave as though today we are completing our work and have not been elected for an entire 5-year term. It is as if we would not have sessions from the 20th of June or an autumn session. We can amend the decisions we are making today. If some of the chairmen of the committees or commissions or the deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union works poorly, we can and have every right to voice our lack of confidence and elect someone else.

At present, we actually have received lists which do not offer a choice, but if we begin demanding alternative choices for all the committee chairmen, then we will have simply to go home now and shift this question to the autumn session. This is not realistic. At 0100 the Soviet of Nationalities will discuss the same thing, and at 0400 we will choose the committees of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. Let us be realistic? Each a compromise. We are not finished yet. Ahead of us are 5 years, as far as I can see, of protracted, intense work. We will work 6 months a year. But we are behaving as if we intended to meet just for 2 days and should settle all the questions. For this reason I agree with the candidacy proposed here by the Presidium, and I urge you to vote and not argue over procedural questions and not unnecessarily draw out our session, as was the case yesterday and, unfortunately, as happened by the end of the congress. The congress ended, in my opinion, shabbily. The microphones had to be turned off, and we must not repeat this at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you.

From the floor: Let me answer Comrade Medvedev in a couple of words. The problem is that he is urging the following compromise: Supposedly it is nothing terrible if we make an error now. But why start our work with a mistake. Of course, it is the prerogative of the chairman to choose his deputy. This is natural, because he must work with him. But we are now speaking about the very urgent need to improve the authority of the Supreme Soviet, the congress, and the chambers. There is a management principle that a strong leader chooses strong deputies. Moreover, the need may arise for the deputy to work in the place of the chairman. From the viewpoint of preparing successors, it would be a good

thing if the chairman would propose a young person as a deputy. The problem is that you have selected your deputy according to the opposite principle. Not for management style and not for competence but a completely different principle. For this reason I am categorically against such an approach. I feel that you should have a person who can take over for you in all regards. Why start such a serious undertaking with experiments and errors?

From the floor: I support the proposal of Comrade Sobchak. And we have not heard from the other candidates. We must spend an hour or two but ultimately arrive at some result.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, I would like to reply to this comment. You see, I am actually interested, as the chairman of the Soviet of the Union, that the deputies of the chairman of the Soviet of the Union be capable and strong persons. I am interested in having them work for not less than 2 years, for rotation to be carried out, as was proposed here, as this is correct. Because they should not be working under the sword of Damocles which could drop at any moment. But, when a new membership is being formed, in some places we should have the right to make a mistake. Because it is simply impossible now to settle these questions in an absolutely mistake-free manner. For this reason I would like to support Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev when he says that our work is not coming to an end today. Please.

Yu.I. Borodin, chairman of the Presidium of the Siberian Division of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, RSFSR, Novosibirsk (from the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences together with 40 medical scientific societies): I would like to draw attention to the following. At present from the health parameters we must also certainly determine the development of the socioeconomic processes in the nation as a whole. And for the world as a whole. It seems to me that if this post is held by a representative of medicine, this is in no way worse and is possibly more beneficial than a representative of the humanities. Moreover, we, the medical personnel—I, too, am a physician—consider ourselves to be among the workers in the humanities. Thank you. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you.

V.A. Shapovalenko, laboratory head at the Volga-Urals Scientific Research and Design Institute for the Extraction and Processing of Hydrogen Sulfide Containing Gases at the Orenburggazprom [Orenburg Gas Industry] Association, Orenburg (Orenburg City Territorial Electoral District): It seems to me that we are again being led astray by polemics. It is essential to save time; we have a long time to work. You see what is being done? Again they want to turn us into simple choosers. People now are speaking not merely against a candidacy, not merely against the medical personnel but against the turning of us, the deputies, into simple choosers and voters. By analogy with the congress we chose all of those proposed to us,

without any choice. Now we are being offered commissions and later ministers. Later they will say: Where were you, comrades? We have already prepared the ministers for you; it is your duty merely to vote. I have a request: With all respect for the chairman and for the worthy candidates, provide us an opportunity to put up two or three candidates, to give some reflection on it and choose. This is a cry from our soul. We have not discussed anyone but merely raised our hands. For this reason I feel that those persons are right who are requesting an alternative candidate, at least in something.

From the floor: I feel that we must save time. Let us hear the second candidate.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please. Would you please, Comrade Prunskene.

From the floor: And who is the second deputy—we should know now. Possibly they complement one another and there will be no questions.

Ye.M. Primakov: Nodar Mikhaylovich Mgaloblishvili.

From the floor: What is he by profession?

Ye.M. Primakov: By profession, an architect.

From the floor: A very good match. That is fine, in my opinion.

K.D.P. Prunskene, rector of the Institute for the Advanced Training of National Economic Specialists Under the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, Vilnius (Shyaulay Territorial Electoral District): Respected colleagues! I am grateful to Comrade Sobchak for supporting my candidacy and for the confidence because I value his opinion. We have already had an opportunity to make certain that is his opinion. Nevertheless, this was very unexpected for me. Believe me, I have never considered this and never gave it any thought. I am completely, completely satisfied that I was to participate in the Committee for Economic Reform. Incidentally, as you know, I am an economist and even before the work of the congress was collaborating with Moscow economists in working out the instructions to the Supreme Soviet on economic reform. This professional work of an economist should remain for me the basic one in the future. I do not want to and cannot lose my profession. I am now somewhat perplexed by the fact that I am unable to assess how the proposed position could be combined with my professional work and with work on economic reform. I will not conceal from you that for me the economic independence of a republic and of course my republic, Lithuania, is very important and that from the very outset I have been one of the coauthors for raising this problem in the Baltic region and, of course, in Lithuania. For precisely this reason this work is now the main thing for me.

I have several other doubts. In the first place, I agree that each chairman himself has the right to select or propose a candidate for the selection of deputies. For several years I myself was a deputy director and the director had

invited me to take the job. At present, I myself am a rector, and I select my own prorectors. For this reason it is very important that opinions coincide. I recall that I was asking Comrade Primakov some questions, and I had certain doubts, for example, whether our views converged over the content of the USSR. I have not heard a clear answer concerning his position in relation to the sovereignty of a republic. This can be understood as it presently is, that is, as is stated in the constitution. We are supposedly sovereign republics. Nevertheless, we are completely without rights. On the other hand, this question, of course, is now being posed completely differently and I realize that the respected chairman is in no way a conservative person. That is not what I think. At the same time, I feel that the coinciding of views for the chairman and the deputy is very important. On the other hand, you say that opposition in any spheres is a healthy phenomenon and possibly this is a counterweight to my hesitations. For this reason we ourselves should give some thought to this.... For me, this question is a surprise and I myself cannot even now determine whether it is worthwhile for me to participate in this discussion at all, without rejecting my candidacy. This is all too complicated for now.

Of course, if here among you there are more like thinkers than those few whom I met during the congress and who are concerned with turning the union from a unitary state into precisely an union of sovereign republics, then possibly my work here would make some contribution to the process of change. Although I realize that a majority of the congress deputies has in no way set these goals either for the congress or for their own work as people's deputies. For this reason standing here before you now, I doubt there is that support which exists even among the deputies of the Supreme Soviet, that is, the Soviet Union. Thank you.

Ye.M. Primakov: Many thanks, please sit down.... Comrade Prunskene will work on the Committee for Economic Reform Affairs. I feel that she is essential on this committee.... Do you want to ask something?

From the floor: Would you inquire whether she agrees to move permanently to Moscow and give up her work; we did not get this.

Ye.M. Primakov: Anatoliy Aleksandrovich [Sobchak] is very right in taking the initiative. But, comrades, when alternative candidacies arise you must consider that a number of alternative candidates were examined before a certain choice was made.

From the floor: What alternative candidacies?

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades! Let us strictly follow the constitution, because it is possible to ask many questions about who examines whom and so forth. Let me repeat again that I as the chairman of the chamber have the right to propose certain candidacies of the post of my deputies. You have the right to review, reject them if you consider it necessary or approve. But you must not constantly ask rhetorical questions of who has examined

whom. Probably you suspect that I was given some instructions and am proposing candidates to you following these instructions. For this reason let us abandon these questions. If you don't mind please.

V.I. Semukha, chairman of the Central Committee of the Red Cross Society of Belorussia, Minsk (from the USSR Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies): Respected comrade deputies! I feel that it would not be an error if we elected Deputy Iskakova as deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union. I should say that each physician has an analytical mind—that is first of all. The medical institute teaches this. Second, Comrade Iskakova has spoken here and shown her independent position. Naturally, she is still young and cannot have experience. That is understood. But she does have a definite position.

I am speaking, comrades, not because I know Comrade Iskakova. This is the first time I have seen her, but I feel that she will fill this position. I request that she be supported. Thank you.

N.N. Pribylova, chair head and professor at the Kursk Medical Institute, RSFSR, Kursk (from the Women's Councils Under the Soviet Women's Committee): Respected deputies! If I were to have my personal view, I would also favor an alternative and a competitive choice of candidates. But, comrades, before proposing competitive candidates, we must first of all discuss them and reach agreement. Another viewpoint which we do not consider is the psychological compatibility of people who will work together. For this reason we naturally should discuss first the candidates which are proposed to us by the chairman of the Soviet of the Union. From the viewpoint of a physician, I can say that here many deputies wrongly feel that the profession of a physician is narrowly limited. You will note that in virtually all the deputy programs there are questions of protecting the health of the nation which is in a critical state. Health is not only medical questions but also social and ecological problems and, I feel, our representative from Kazakhstan, a woman physician and a representative of the most humane profession, can resolve many questions better than an economist. It is your opinion whether to support or not to support, but I propose that we support precisely her candidacy, the candidacy of a physician.

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you. Please.

A.V. Milkin, first secretary of the East Kazakhstan Obkom of the Kazakhstan Communist Party, Ust-Kamenogorsk (Zyryanovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kazakhstan): I would like, in the first place, not to agree with the comrades that we have an opportunity in discussing the candidates before such a large audience in elucidating in detail the qualities of the candidate. This, it seems to me, should be preceded without fail by preliminary consultations among those persons who submit these proposals. I am now confident that such consultations were made. This is the first thing. Comrades have voiced doubts that this will always be the case

in the future, including, let us assume, in approving the ministers. The comrades simply do not know. I propose, what the procedure for this is. This will be the concern of a commission, a commission of 30-40 specialists, and of course over an extended discussion with the minister the deputies can gain some notion of whether the candidate is worthy of the high post. Now as for Comrade Iskakova. She is a representative of Kazakhstan, a medical worker, and we know her in the republic and her activist position. Of course, we feel now that she, in holding the post of a rayon physician, is not ready for large-scale state work. But we, certainly, many of us are also not ready for this. For this reason, in knowing her personally and her professional qualities, I feel that we are correct today to support and recommend this candidate for the position of deputy chairman of the chamber.

Ye.M. Primakov: Before moving on to the voting, if there are no other proposals, I would like to say that I would invite Comrade Prunskene in the next term to be the deputy. I am certain that we would be completely compatible. You are wrong to say that this would not be the case.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: Now, let us vote on this question. I propose that we vote on precisely these mandates, because among us there are no deputies of the Supreme Soviet who have a consultative voice, that is, the people's deputies from the congress. Who is in favor of electing Comrade Bayan Seilkhanovna Iskakova deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union? Would you please vote. Hands down. Who is against? One, two...four people are against, five...five against. Abstentions? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven...eleven abstentions.

Passed. Bayan Seilkhanovna Iskakova has been elected deputy chairman of our chamber. (Applause).

Would you please come up here, Bayan Seilkhanovna. I would like to offer my excuses for having to go through such voting. Clearly before the next session we will resolve the question and we will not have to have the counting of votes. The counting will be electronic.

The next candidate is Nodar Mikhaylovich Mgaloblishvili, born in 1927, a Georgian with a higher education. In 1952, he completed the Moscow Architecture Institute and is an architect. He has been a member of the CPSU since 1955. USSR people's deputy. Deputy to the Georgian Supreme Soviet. He was also the chief architect of Tbilisi and prorector of the Tbilisi Academy of Arts. At present, Nodar Mikhaylovich is the chairman of the board of the Georgian Union of Architects and secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Architects. A very active man with an activist position in life. Here he has a balanced approach to many events, including those occurring in the republic, a person of his own opinion which he is able to defend and always does defend. He has great respect in the republic and among

specialists on the national level. Please, Nodar Mikhaylovich. Are there questions, comrades?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili, architect, chairman of the board of the Georgian Union of Architects, Tbilisi (from the USSR Union of Architects): Perhaps I should say several words to eliminate certain questions because it is important certainly for the deputies to know the stance of whom they will elect. Let me add a few words here and possibly this will shorten the time of our choosing. I should say that in a conversation Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze said that for him the greatest surprise was when he was appointed minister of foreign affairs. Do not take this as some comparison or as a lack of humility but also for me in my life this was also a completely unexpected proposal.

I am an architect, I am the chairman of the Georgian Union of Architects, as you heard, I completed the Moscow Architectural Institute. I worked 30 years in Moscow, I had an apartment here, a job, my wife was Russian and also an architect, a Muscovite from Borovskiy Street. In 1963, we left for Tbilisi, we settled there and began to organize our lives although in truth the apartment has still not been repaired. And now for me a return to Moscow would be a very difficult problem.

Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov at the session clearly defined the tasks of the chamber of the Soviet of the Union. I feel that our main task is to create a state with real laws, the establishing of actually a state of law.

In the first place. It seems to me that the task of a deputy chairman of a chamber of the Supreme Soviet is to carefully hear out all sides—both right and left—and generalize all the materials received from the people. All questions are to be resolved together with the Soviet, only with the Soviet and with no one else except the Soviet.

Secondly, it seems to me that many questions in the Supreme Soviet will fall by the wayside, when in all the republics there is complete economic independence and real sovereignty when the Supreme Soviet of each republic and each people themselves will resolve 50 or even more percent of all those problems which now arise here. Then the USSR Supreme Soviet will receive only the cardinal, main interrepublic questions and not all of the petty details which could be completely settled on the spot.

Third, it seems to me that we should not "kill off" the all-union ministries, they will wither away themselves or in any event will become significantly smaller when each republic, including the RSFSR, will have economic sovereignty and will be able itself to resolve all its questions. This is precisely what the Baltic republics are proposing. Certainly we will all remain in a single commonwealth and if a disaster arises then we will help jointly as we helped Armenia with the terrible earthquake. Let us summon up our patience and at the end of the 1990s let

us examine the results of the experiment in the Baltic republics. If the need exists, we all will help them as certainly we help the Latin American countries. And possibly it may happen that Estonia and Lithuania themselves will help us, as, for example, Finland does. This will be a fine example for all republics. For this reason I feel that our common task is to hear one another out very carefully, without shouting and hubbub and calmly but also without delaying, take decisions which are the optimum and most beneficial to the people.

A few words about the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. I am absolutely certain that this congress will be a turning point in the history of our nation. One would like to believe, I think, that our people, a patient and long-suffering people, will live better. And as a whole rejoicing over the flourishing of democracy at the congress I would now like to voice out of the numerous ideas just three comments which, it might be said, lie on the surface.

In the first place, I am greatly jarred when the well thought out and carefully prepared proposals submitted by our Baltic colleagues in the required, strictly parliamentary form are greeted by a certain portion of our congress by uncivilized whistling, cat-calling, and outright nonparliamentary insults. (Applause).

Second, I am ashamed when the boors—and I simply am unable to find a better word—insult two of the most prominent persons of our nation, of the world: Gorbachev and Sakharov. While the impolite attacks against Mikhail Sergeyevich can be explained by the lack of upbringing and lack of culture of the speaker, the heartrending shouts and hysterical escapades against, we will admit, the challenging thoughts of Andrey Dmitriyevich [Sakharov] cannot be explained. (Applause).

And, finally, third. I find it simply terrible when after the speech by the commander of the punitive expedition of 9 April to Tbilisi (who stated that there were anti-Russian slogans there and that for this women and children were cruelly killed) that same portion of the deputy audience virtually gave him an ovation. I state with full responsibility that in Georgia there are no anti-Russian moods! Not one, let me repeat, not a single Russian suffered for the fact that he was Russian. But how immoral it is before the very eyes of the entire congress to applaud a statement that peaceful women were killed for nonexistent anti-Russian feelings. This was terrible. No, we did not expect such a response from certain of our deputies, colleagues, and friends. But I am an optimist. And I repeat, our strictly democratic congress, is an enormous victory for perestroika and I am confident that in time we will have our economic successes and the people will live better. We should all make a great effort to work closely together. Thank you for the attention.

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you. Questions, please.

N.S. Sazonov, secretary of the party committee for automatic lathe work at the Kama Motor Vehicle Plant, Naberezhnyye Chelny (Naberezhnyye Chelny Territorial Electoral District, Tatar ASSR): You have said that in general there would be what Yevgeniy Maksimovich [Primakov] said, that is, the establishing of a state of law in our nation. I would like to obtain from you an answer to whether any state which exists is not unjust? Possibly here it is an issue of the very law which was created in the 1930s, that very bandit law against the people? How do you conceive of the establishing of a state of law in our country?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I think the way others do. I conceive of a state of law as follows: The constitution which has been written and which we have adopted is carried out precisely as it has been written, without any deviations and without any amendments. If in the constitution a certain article is incorrect, then we will amend it. This is what I call a state of law. When in the state, without any exceptions, from the top to the bottom, everyone is subordinate to the law.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there other questions, comrades? Please.

V.N. Stepanov, director of the Vidlitskiy Fur Sovkhoz in Olonetskiy Rayon, Karelian ASSR (Petrozavodsk Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): I am very pleased that at present an architect is being presented for such a high post because the sector of architecture in our country on a whole is on a very low level. I would like to ask several questions regardless of the fact that the candidate by his speech has somewhat altered my attitude toward him because he has again begun to raise doubts as to the Tbilisi events. This is a pity. Nevertheless, two questions.

First: How do you intend, being an architect and assuming this high post, to change the attitude in our entire society to this painful problem of architecture? The second question: Would it not be advisable at present, as a whole, to put the sector of architecture and construction into the hands of the construction workers so that we would not have clients and contractors and the unnecessary scribbling which exists now and so that everything would be in one hand and they would build turnkey and turn them over to those who will operate the projects? Those are the two questions.

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I should say that this is my field. I have devoted my entire life precisely to architecture and architecture, as the Ancient Greeks said, is the mother of all arts. At the same time, I must say that each state has an architecture which conforms to its economic base. Architecture precisely depicts the economic preparedness of a nation where it exists. For this reason the poor state of our architecture has depended upon our economic state. If our economic situation grows stronger and improves the architecture will be better. As for our architects, I can say with full confidence that in the Soviet Union the architects are in no way worse than they are in other countries. I would say that in certain

instances they are even better as has been proven by those numerous victories in international competitions where they have participated. But, unfortunately, these ideas of the architects are not always carried out. This is the answer to the first question.

For the second question: I am also of the same opinion that it is wrong to put construction and architecture in opposition. This is generally an incorrect, unintelligent dividing into construction and architecture. Architecture consists of designing and building. We feel that architecture is designing and all the same, even thinking this way, architecture must be put in first place because we first design and then build. This is again the question of the cart and the horse, of what goes in front. So here I agree fully with you and think that on this committee where great work will be done, finally architecture will come into its own. Architecture is the main historical chronicle of all mankind and it will hold its proper place.

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you. Please, Roy Aleksandrovich. Now just a minute, I will record you....

R.A. Medvedev, writer, Moscow (Voroshilovskiy Electoral District, Moscow): I support the candidate proposed for the post of second deputy of the chairman of the Soviet of the Union. All the same, I would like to make one comment on his references to Tbilisi. I myself was elected to a commission on a no less delicate and difficult matter, on the question related to Gdlyan and Ivanov and as I will announce obviously at the joint session, was elected chairman. The first thing with which we started, we agreed not to comment before the end of the commission's work (applause), not to grant any interviews, and to urge the press not to publish materials. Possibly for the residents of Tbilisi this is not obligatory but for the deputies who chose the commission on Tbilisi and which has not yet handed down its decisions and made its conclusions, I feel that it is not completely ethical to categorically voice an opinion on this question. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: In taking advantage of this proposal, I would like to ask all the comrade deputies: For now let us not exchange opinions on the heart of this question while the commission is still working. Alright?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I accept that comment and for this reason will not comment.

Ye.M. Primakov: Good...not on this question?

V.G. Kulikov, marshal of the Soviet Union, general inspector of the Group of General Inspectors of the USSR Ministry of Defense, Moscow (from the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Organization): May I.

Ye.M. Primakov: You have a question? Yes?

V.G. Kulikov: No, not a question. I would like to state an opinion.

Ye.M. Primakov: We will not hear an opinion.

V.G. Kulikov: Then I will ask the following question. Very respected comrade whom we wish with dignity to propose as deputy, did he himself see what happened in Tbilisi during those very difficult days?

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrade, I also feel....

V.G. Kulikov: Then I want to say why did you in receiving such a major appointment ahead of time already name some special expedition, campaign, and so forth and thereby put others in an awkward position and provide grounds for the fanning of passions? I will vote against you.

From the floor: Can I ask a question?

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, any proposals.

From the floor: Again, may I request, comrade deputies, that the question of Tbilisi not be touched upon until the discussion is completed. (Stir in the auditorium).

Ye.M. Primakov: I feel we have agreed on this. Right? Agreed? Question?

From the floor: I would like to voice an opinion, Yevgeniy Maksimovich.

Ye.M. Primakov: No, first the question.

From the floor: I have a question.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, the question.

From the floor (a people's deputy from Belorussia): In your speech you categorically spoke on the experience of the Baltic republics and focus attention on the Tbilisi case. I have a question related to this. Will you be impartial in the post of deputy chairman or will you also have your say as you did in your speech?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: At the very outset I stated that a deputy should very carefully hear out all speeches both right and left, weigh these, and then together with the Soviet resolve these questions. I was simply voicing my opinion as it is. This does not mean that I should impose my opinion on anyone.

Ye.M. Primakov: Just a minute, please....

From the floor: Nodar Mikhaylovich, your speech reflected the pain of disabled persons of all categories over the question of the construction of new projects in the future in terms of considering their specific requirements. For this reason I have a question for you: What is your opinion, considering the particular features of the work of the Committee on Construction and Architecture, and what position do you hold over the question of whether we will be able at least in building new projects to take into account the specific requirements of all disabled persons.

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I feel that we will be able to and we should without fail. Otherwise, if the specific requirements are not considered here then it is no architectural

work. All the functions which are required in these structures must be taken into account without fail.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, a question.

B.V. Kryzhkov, deputy chief of production at the Dzerzhinsk Caprolactam Production Association, Dzerzhinsk (Dzerzhinsk Territorial Electoral District, Gorkiy Oblast): We, in electing the deputy chairman of a chamber of the new parliament, in the given instance want first to select a politician, that is, here it is not a question of whether the candidate has done well in the area of architecture, but rather to what degree in the given instance the political qualities of the candidate conform to this role. I have a question. When you mentioned the events in Tbilisi, and I am not taking them up, were you pursuing national goals or were you appealing to the Georgian nation? Because in the given instance I would have doubts as to whether from the political viewpoint you would defend precisely the national interests.

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I will not comment on this but I, of course, will consider precisely the interests of the union, if need be, even globally.

From the floor: This evening, I returned from Fergana Valley. I have an urgent question. During the last years of the war, the most flagrant barbarian tyranny was committed against the Meskhetian Turks. Without any justification they were violently expelled from Georgia. A certain portion of these Meskhetian Turks living in the Fergana Valley has now experienced a second tragedy which is inadmissible and impossible and even incompatible with our moral traditions. What do you think, here is this people which was illegally expelled from its homeland where their brothers, children, and fathers had lived for the millennia and to which we had given them a legitimate right, could they be moved back to their homeland? If you were deputy, what means would you endeavor to find to more quickly cure this grief of the people and return them to their homeland?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: Probably you would not believe me if I were to resolve this problem right now on the rostrum. This is a very difficult question. It must be thoroughly studied. We must investigate all the "pros" and "cons," talk with all these Turks who are living there and decide the question as it should be.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: My personal attitude? I feel that everything should be settled justly and absolutely. As I understand, those Turks who want to live where they lived before should live where they lived before. It would be very hard to set any particular dates. These Turks moved in in some century and then they left.... I feel that such a question must be settled in the same as we did with the Crimean Tatars, the Germans, and so forth. This is a difficult question.

From the floor: I would like to say the following. It is very pleasant that I am not alone and we have all seen the good, interesting thoughts, in particular, in the draft of the economic reform of the Estonian comrades. You have defined my question. What is your position? One of the points in this draft states that the enterprises of the union level and subordination located on the territory of a republic are to be turned over gratis. What is your opinion on this point?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I am unable to answer this question now because I have not studied it very profoundly. I must examine it properly and together with you, with the entire Soviet, resolve it.

From the floor: Nodar Mikhaylovich, I am grateful to you for the sincerity. I view your speech as a sincere desire to say what you think. But I have a different sort of question. I would be curious to see what your thinking is. Please tell us on difficult questions are you a supporter of roll-call voting or do you support such procedures as we have now?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I am a supporter of roll-call voting. I feel that each person should be responsible for his vote because there are instances when they vote looking over their shoulder. And it does happen that a deputy thinks one thing but votes differently. There are such instances. In certain instances secret balloting will be necessary. But this is already a different procedure.

Ye.M. Primakov: You have a question?

V.M. Ryabkov, rector of the G.I. Nosov Magnitogorsk Mining-Metallurgical Institute, Magnitogorsk (Chelyabinsk National Territorial Electoral District): I, of course, am also in favor of having not only people in the humanities represented on the leadership of the chamber....

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: We, architects, also consider ourselves in the humanities field.

From the floor: Yes, but because it is actually the case that everyone becomes humanitarians in time. I have the following question. You are concerned with architecture. This is truly a mirror of the socioeconomic status of society. Could you now name points in our nation which require prime, preferential socioeconomic "overhaul"?

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: There are many such points. But still it seems to me that this would be the North, Far East, Central Asia, Transcaucasus, Baltic, Non-chernozem Zone, Russia, Moscow, and Kazan. There are very many points. For this reason I feel that at the congresses of people's deputies we must resolve all these questions. I have already said and feel now that each region itself should basically resolve its own questions. And we should resolve the interregional, interrepublic, and statewide questions all together.

Ye.M. Primakov: One last question, please.

From the floor: There are no questions.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

From the floor: May I?

Ye.M. Primakov: No, wait a minute, I have given the floor to someone else.

From the floor: I do not have any questions. I am very pleased that we are discussing precisely such a candidate. We all know that architecture is what remains after us. And we know what the nation's situation is in terms of architecture. It is the most abused of all types of the arts. I feel that the candidate being discussed for such a high post is very correct. We know that architects are very constructive people. And constructivism a constructivist approach is precisely what our policy needs. I strongly approve this candidate.

Ye.M. Primakov: So, comrades, we have agreed that we have finished the questions.

From the floor: We have finished. The second part of the question...(inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: What is the second part of the question?

From the floor: The second part of the question consists in the following: We are converting to regional cost accounting, self-financing, and the covering of costs. In this instance how do you feel the initial socioeconomic state of the regions should be considered and how do you intend to consider this?

Ye.M. Primakov: I would like to say that generally it would be possible to ask a mass of questions of each person for all of the main, so to speak, issues and for all the main outlines of our present life. But he should not be required to answer all the purely economic questions.

N.M. Mgaloblishvili: I will still answer. Tomorrow let us all move to cost accounting: each region, each republic, as it is ready for this, and then let us examine the results.... This cannot be done altogether and pell-mell.... Later, I feel, we are obliged to help one another. On this matter. But this does not mean that economic separateness is [attatsyya—word as published] but also integration. Again we will be altogether and certainly should be together and otherwise I do not conceive of this economic problem.

From the floor: Break off the questions.

Ye.M. Primakov: There is a proposal to break off the questions. Just a minute. There is a proposal to break off the questions because they can be infinite. Who is in favor of this proposal, please vote. Who is against? Who abstains? A clear minority. The questions are halted. Who would like to speak? Please sit down, Nodar Mikhaylovich.

Yes, please.

F.M. Burlatskiy, political reviewer from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Moscow (from the Soviet Peace Fund

together with eight Soviet committees in favor of peace, solidarity, and international collaboration): First, on the candidates. My name is Burlatskiy but I will not state my profession, comrades. I feel that deputies and representatives of the entire people have assembled here and in this instance a profession is in no way obligatory. A physician, an architect, a lawyer—this will be of importance when we organize the committees and commissions. There a professional orientation is essential. But in elections to these positions a profession is of secondary significance. I think that you will agree with me, comrades.

In addition, another general consideration. Regional representation or the representation of a social organization is not so important. Again, you have been elected by different regions, different social organizations but we are parliamentarians and we are now in a new role. The representative of any region, comrades, any profession should feel himself responsible for the destiny of the nation and a national question which, of course, also tells on the fate of a region and on the fate of one or another social organization. This is another general comment.

Now, on the candidate being discussed. Dear Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I, unfortunately, did not even hear the name of this candidate. I asked my comrade sitting next to me but I still did not learn his last name. They said it might be....

Ye.M. Primakov: Nodar Mikhaylovich Mgaloblishvili.

F.M. Burlatskiy: Nodar Mikhaylovich, thank you very much. We should really first send out a biography. This is a little consideration and request. Biographies were sent out for all the remaining candidates and here a biography should have been sent out. That is for the future. In order for us to be able to be participants in the process and not bystanders. We are not bystanders here but participants in the process and we are taking crucial decisions. Now on the candidate himself. I will tell you: I have never known him, I did not even hear his name, but he made a good impression on me. How? By the fact that he set out his position frankly. We may not agree on something, but he frankly set out his position on the most acute questions and did not avoid issues, as certain persons do who wish to slip into some position. This is very important, comrades. A candidate can later adjust his position, he can reflect on Tbilisi, on other questions and on economic problems. But the fact that he has a position and is ready to think about problems raised by others is a very positive trait for the deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union. For this reason, comrades, regardless of the fact that we may have differences over his various statements, let us assess his sincerity and the ability to take up a position.

I am in favor of electing him the deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union.

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you, Fedor Mikhaylovich [Burlatskiy]. Before turning over the floor to the next speaker, I would like to apologize for the staff of the Presidium for the fact that objective data were not sent out ahead of

time concerning the candidates. We will take this matter into account and correct it. Please.

O.M. Savostyuk, graphic designer, secretary of the board of the USSR Artists Union and chairman of the board of the Moscow Organization of the Artists Union, Moscow (from the USSR Union of Artists): I want to support this candidate. I know this person as a person of very broad views, a very educated person, and a person who permits different constructive opinions in seeking the truth. And at present this is very important.

S.F. Akhromeyev, counsellor of the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow (Beltsiy Territorial Electoral District, Moldavia): I would also like to comment on the candidate's speech. It is correct and good that he voiced his position frankly. This characterizes him in a good light, because before an election a person may have certain conflicting ideas. But he put aside these conflicting ideas and stated his position. This characterizes a comrade well. But, on the other hand, and incidentally since you, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, propose him and you are the chairman, I will vote for him but I have this to say. We have been elected by the deputies, comrades, over the period of the entire congress and although we have many shortcomings and errors in our work, still a line has been formed that we must understand one another, we must understand one another's position, we should take into account if someone expresses the majority opinion at a given moment, we must consider and give attention to the minority opinion in order to reflect on this opinion and shape a single opinion which is then worked out in a single decision. So the comrade spoke and stated his opinion, a very extreme opinion, and I would say aggressively so. What does this say about his position, about him personally, well and good, but he should also have the wisdom that my position is not the only one, not the most correct. He should still consider the position of others. From this viewpoint, being the deputy chairman, he should be more patient for the opinions of other deputies and he should generally be more tolerant of an opinion when it is being formed. I would like for him to consider this.

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you. Who else wishes to speak? Please.

A.A. Sobchak, chair head of the Legal Faculty of Leningrad State University (Vasileostrovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Leningrad): I want to support the candidacy of Comrade Mgaloblishvili and urge the other deputies to vote for him. Why? Because today possibly for the first time in several days we have seen on the rostrum a real individual, a person with independent, developed broad views. And I feel that he will fill this post well.

Ye.M. Primakov: Thank you. Please.... No, I have already given the floor.

S.S. Sulakshin, laboratory head at the Scientific Research Institute for Nuclear Physics, Tomsk (Tomsk

Territorial Electoral District, Tomsk Oblast): Allow me to state my opinion which is that the respected candidate for the post of deputy chairman began defining his position from a definition of his moral stance. I feel that in the very complex problems—social, economic, and political which confront all of us—the guide and support in taking decisions should be precisely moral criteria. Certain deputies who have already spoken here fear that the respected colleague and candidate for the post of deputy chairman will abandon his likes or dislikes on specific problems, including those related to regional problems, republic cost accounting, and problems of an ethnic nature. I am confident that a person who has a firm moral stance and is not afraid of defining it at the very outset of his activities is capable of giving up his likes for the sake of objectivity, for the sake of supporting the requirements of the union as a whole, and is capable of rising above narrow regional and narrow nationality interests. For this reason if I possessed the right of a decisive vote, I would vote for the respected candidate for the post of deputy chairman and urge you to vote for him. Thank you.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

Yu.N. Shcherbak, writer and secretary of the board of the Ukrainian Writers' Union (Shevchenkovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kiev): I fully support the candidacy of Nodar Mikhaylovich and I was greatly pleased by his speech and by his assessment of the moral atmosphere at the congress and the speech by Academician Sakharov and the events in Tbilisi. I believe that the person set out his position correctly and honestly and this is much better, in my view, than when people become cautious and endeavor to play with objectivity. For this reason they are unpredictable. This person is predictable, I see that this is a person of great honor because he has not been afraid of stating his views here. I fully support him and would also like to say that the Ukrainian people have always entertained feelings of great friendship for the Georgian people and I will vote for this candidate.

Ye.M. Primakov: Many thanks. Comrades, let us end the discussion. Does anyone else wish to be heard? Please...just a minute, I will give the floor to a woman.... Good, good, please, I now give you the floor.

N.S. Sazonov, secretary of the Party Committee for Automatic Lathe Production at the Kama Motor Vehicle Plant, Naberezhnyye Chelny (Naberezhnyye Chelny Territorial Electoral District, Tatar ASSR): Comrade deputies! Let us forget the term "elections," because there were no elections at the congress and at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, there were only appointments according to the various articles of the USSR Constitution. If we actually wish to organize elections, I strongly urge you, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, to give us a second candidate. I personally am not against the proposed candidate. But let us discuss and then choose from the two candidates. While for the first deputy we generally were granted an opportunity to vote without any alternative considering that a woman was proposed to us, and

we gave preference to her, for the second candidacy, for the post of second deputy, I would still request a second candidate.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, I am confident that a predominant majority of the deputies knows about this but I urge everyone who does not know about this, about the procedure, to realize that we are not discussing alternative proposals. There were alternatives and alternatives were reviewed. An actual candidate is being proposed. It is your right to vote for him or to reject him. In this instance, if the candidate is rejected, then the chairman of the chamber whom you have already elected and whom you have confidence in is to propose the next candidate. This is how things are under the constitution.... So, please.

From the floor: I do not dispute the right of the chairman to propose a candidate, this is his constitutional right. I also have great respect for the Georgian people and hence what I say now does not relate to the Georgians. I simply want to say that I will vote against the proposed candidate because in the Soviet of the Union we are presently electing a representative to a high post who should be concerned with the interests of the entire union. In the speech of a man who by profession is an architect I did not hear a single idea concerning the areas located beyond the Urals. That is the first thing.

Second, the candidate for this position has lived for a long time in Tbilisi. He lives next to an area which in December was subjected to an enormous tragedy, and in his program I have heard nothing of what he, in assuming this post, would do to prevent such tragedies in the future because just over the last 20 years our union has also been shaken by such events. For this reason I would forgive this in a person from a different specialty. In the given case, I do not feel that this person would think completely about the entire nation. His interests are concentrated in the Caucasus and in the Baltic.

Ye.M. Primakov: There is a proposal to vote. Before we move on to the voting, I want to assure the comrade deputies that all the people chosen by us and who will work here at the head of the chamber will be guided solely by the interests of the union as a whole. And I want to assure you also that as long as I am working here I will observe all of this. And here when certain views are voiced by one or another candidate for the post of deputy chairman, I feel that he is merely voicing his own personal views. And as soon as he begins to work here, he will work proceeding from the interests of our union as a whole. I propose...just a minute. It has been moved to vote. Right?

From the auditorium: Right.

Ye.M. Primakov: I move that we vote. Those in favor of electing Comrade Nodar Mikhaylovich Mgaloblishvili as deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union, please vote. We must count, comrades. We must count...please put your hands down. Who is against? We will have to appoint counters and count.... Possibly you could take

that part and I, possibly, can count here...comrades, someone count from here. Who is against?... 102 persons against. Abstentions?

From the auditorium: The consultative votes, too.

Ye.M. Primakov: Why the consultative votes? Please count here. Would you please count in this sector.... In this sector, please, count. And there, in that sector, also please...those who are abstaining please stand up...wait a minute we are now counting those in favor...who abstains?

We must now recount, who is in favor, comrades. That makes...now for the count of the "nays"—102, 14 abstentions and 259 persons registered. We must count those in favor. Those in favor please stand up. We do not need two-thirds but 50 percent.... (Counting of votes under way).

Comrades, let me announce the results: 128 in favor. The nays and abstentions are 116 (102 nays and 14 abstentions).

Comrade Nodar Mikhaylovich Mgaloblishvili has been elected deputy. (Applause).

I would like Nodar Mikhaylovich to take this place.

From the floor: How many registered are there?

Ye.M. Primakov: 259 are registered. (Noise in the auditorium).

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades we'll count, as some probably did not vote. (Noise in the auditorium). Well look...wait a minute, now we will recount. There were 244 participating in the voting, and 15 did not vote. Is anyone in doubt? (Stir in the auditorium, voices of "less than 50 percent"). Do you propose recounting the nays?

From the hall: Yes.

Ye.M. Primakov: Alright, let us recount the nays. I ask all the counters to count carefully.

From the auditorium: The voting must be completely repeated.

Ye.M. Primakov: Why? For what reason?

From the hall: Well, there could make a mistake.

Ye.M. Primakov: Who could make a mistake? Then let's not have the chairman add up but let me request any comrade to make the total. Please. (Stir in the auditorium). What is your opinion? Please.

From the floor: Comrades, we are forgetting that a majority is required from the total number of the deputies of the chamber of the Soviet of the Union. Our total number is 271 deputies. Unfortunately, our candidate has not gathered more than one-half of the total number of the chamber of the Soviet of the Union. I voted for him but the candidate cannot be elected as a result of our voting.

Ye.M. Primakov: Fine. Let the counting commission now.

From the floor: I want...(inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: Just a minute...(stir in the hall). First let us find out: of the number present or of the total number?

From the floor: Many just sign up their friend.

Ye.M. Primakov: Good, good, now let us see. For now, we will not bother with the motives...we do not need a minute for motives...now let us carry out a true vote and then by motives.

R.A. Medvedev, historian, writer (Voroshilovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): I request the floor on voting techniques and not for motives.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, on techniques, please.

R.A. Medvedev: I regret that I must speak frequently. But I am a person from the scholarly world, and we consider it a simple disgrace if in voting on a doctoral or candidate dissertation or a professorial vacancy no one has spoken out against, but in opening the urn for secret balloting it turns out that one-half of the votes is against. I feel that this is a disgrace for the delegates. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Roy Aleksandrovich, if you please, this is not necessary...please refrain from these comments. Just a minute. Comrades, on voting techniques, please.

From the floor: On voting techniques.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, on voting techniques, please.

From the floor: I want to propose something on voting techniques, and I do not know if this will be supported. Let us make the following step away from this primitive system of voting. What sort of counting of votes can there be when the question is close, with such a method of voting there can always be a dispute. For this reason it would be simplest to do as follows. We have registration sheets similar to a roll-call ballot. So let us make the mark there, the count commission can count the crosses and zeros on our lists and an accurate result will be obtained. That is simplest. Let us take the next step away from this primitive system!

From the floor: Let us recount. Let us count those against (the voice of the speaker cannot be heard, stir in the auditorium).

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, let us do the following. The counters who are here, do you trust them?

From the floor: We do.

Ye.M. Primakov: Trust all the counters. I request the counters to come forward. For each sector. Now we will do it all again.

From the floor: Yevgeniy Maksimovich, we might propose that the counters not count from their seats but walk along the rows.

Ye.M. Primakov: Good. Please, a counter from there if there is, that part there. Let's have someone please. Be a bit bolder, someone from this part. Good. Now all the counters. Then possibly someone will put all this together? Well then, I shall do it. Good. Who is in favor of electing Comrade...yes, please.

From the floor: We have not settled a very serious question. How do you count half the votes? Do we use the number of members of the chamber? Or the number of those present? Or those voting?

Ye.M. Primakov: There has been the explanation here that it is half of the number of parliament members. (Stir, voices in the auditorium)

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, just a minute, let me say a couple words.

How do we proceed here? The USSR Supreme Soviet follows the Procedural Rules of the USSR Supreme Soviet which were adopted. Only if it contradicts the Constitution is it not valid. Here it has been established completely firmly that all decrees and other enactments of the Supreme Soviet and, correspondingly, of the chambers, are adopted by a majority of votes from the total number of deputies of the Supreme Soviet. This is Article 48 of the Procedural Rules of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I again want to say, comrades, that this means the chambers. The principal which was established at the congress was also the total number and I can show you the provisional procedural rules, as there it also established the principal of the total number of congress deputies.

Ye.M. Primakov: Proper conduct, please.

S.M. Ryabchenko, laboratory head at the Physics Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Kiev (Moskovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kiev): I would submit that we cannot accept, generally speaking, the explanation given with a reference to the Procedural Rules of the Supreme Soviet. A major shortcoming in the actions of our chamber is that we have not adopted generally even any initial procedural steps and for this reason, since we are not stuck on this question, I would like to make a proposal to formulate a point in the Procedural Rules that a decision is to be taken by a majority of the number present and not according to the listed number. (Stir in the auditorium).

A.I. Lukyanov: Let us agree here. There are constant references to the lack of procedure for resolving various questions. When it was a question of the congress, when we were establishing our rules, we adopted a provisional congress Procedural Rules. As for the Procedural Rules of the Supreme Soviet, to the degree, as was established by the congress, to which they do not run contrary to the legislative enactments, the Constitution and the congress

decisions, they are to be in effect. Everyone has a copy of them. (Stir in the auditorium) Please forgive me, no, I want to say again each of you received a package which contained the Supreme Soviet Procedural Rules. (Stir, voices in the auditorium).

From the floor: We do, Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov], everyone does!

A.I. Lukyanov: Secondly, when this provision was being established in the Procedural Rules (I am speaking to you as a member of the commission for preparing the Procedural Rules), when this procedure was established, it proceeded from the fact that, if we did not establish it as it is, then in this instance with the presence of 51 percent of the persons present in the auditorium for voting, any candidate could be elected by 25 percent plus 1. This is the reason this procedure was established.

Ye.M. Primakov: Hence, in other words....

A.I. Lukyanov: Only from the number of chamber members!

Ye.M. Primakov: Hence, comrades, an explanation has been obtained. Now, if there are no other opinions, let us proceed to the voting. Who is in favor of electing Comrade N.M. Mgaloblishvili deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union, please raise your hands.

Now, if no one has a document for voting for the deputies, for the members of our chamber, or for any other...perhaps they merely forgot, possibly, and so forth. Please go to the counters, introduce yourselves and say for whom you are voting.

(The votes are counted).

Ye.M. Primakov: Now let us see...82, 105, 110, 110 and 19 or 129. Who is against? Would you please stand up.

(The votes are counted).

Ye.M. Primakov: 25, 5, in this sector 36, in this sector 30 and in this 10. There are 106 against. Abstentions? (The votes are counted.) 9 abstentions...11 abstentions...the candidacy of Comrade N.M. Mgaloblishvili is rejected. Thus...hence this question is to be put off to the next session of our chamber, where I will submit to you yet another candidate after review.

So, let us move on to the next question. The question of the commissions. I would initially like to say a few words in order to exclude unjustified, in the given instance, debates. You all have before you lists of the commission members. Comrades, I request your attention!

You all have lists of the commission members. We have set up four commissions, you have established these commissions. The lists of the commissions have a preliminary nature. In other words, we can approve them as a basis now or possibly we can put them off. In particular, Comrade Vezirov has requested and other comrades have requested that certain comrades be moved

from commission to commission or someone be added. But there is, I would like to directly say to the comrade deputies, there is a limit of 400 persons, roughly speaking, from the Supreme Soviet who will be working on the commissions and committees. Using such a proportion if there are 50 for 50 and 50 are those people's deputies who are not part of the Supreme Soviet then it means that 800 persons, roughly speaking, will work constantly in the commissions and committees. The 800 persons are 1/3, roughly speaking, also, of the membership of our corps of people's deputies. Consequently, 2/3 immediately will be unable to work in the commissions and committees. However, there will be rotation. And the rotation will be carried out on the basis generally of to what degree they find persons who actually work and those who merely sign up for the commissions and committees. The leadership of the commissions and committees will naturally endeavor to remove the latter.

For this reason I would request during our discussion not to focus attention on the questions of the commission membership now because all these questions will be resolved as we go along. I would like all of you to concentrate on the leadership of these commissions. We are choosing the leaders, as I have already said, of four commissions. And I would like to say, comrades, that we have discussed many candidates. As a result of a definite selection, we have concluded that we can recommend the following comrades. I will begin with the commission....

From the floor: (Inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: Yes, please.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, I would like to emphasize one thing straight off. Here the question of Deputy M.A. Bocharov has been asked as to who recommended what candidates to the chairman. I would like immediately to stipulate that we agreed at the congress Presidium with the Supreme Soviet Presidium and assigned all the work on consulting on the membership of the commissions and the commission chairmen, their deputies and secretaries to the two chairmen of the chambers. The only, so to speak, guideline which there was here was the very proposals of the deputies and which grew out of questioning. I reported this at your chamber.

For this reason we so drew out the question of forming the commissions, having instructed the two chairmen of the chambers to coordinate this question by agreeing and consulting with the deputies and the deputy groups from the regions and republics. This is what I wanted to say first. Forgive me but I did not say this first.

From the floor: Anatoliy Ivanovich, may I ask a question?

A.I. Lukyanov: Yes.

From the floor: This question was simply not asked. It is a matter of fact that there were no agreements and no proposals for the Moscow deputy group and there are around 195 of us.

Second, the respected chairman of the Chamber said twice that we conducted this procedure in accord with the Constitution. Allow me to ask what article in the Constitution has stipulated the selection and agreement of candidates for leading posts in the Supreme Soviet? This is the problem. From the first days of the work of the Supreme Soviet, the deputies should not be made electors. Yes, we do not have procedural rules now. We should also say something else. Unfortunately, many deputies, well not many possibly certain deputies know how the leadership was chosen.

A.I. Lukyanov: What leadership?

From the floor: I say again that the leadership was chosen by the apparat principal and no agreement was sought with the deputy groups. Certainly this could be confirmed by a number of deputies, certainly someone could assert that these questions were not coordinated with the deputy groups. But that is not the problem.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrade Bocharov, I have spoken with you specifically about your work on the commissions. I have spoken with Comrade Bupich and with many other Moscow representatives, I have spoken with the representatives of other republics and places. But I could not speak with each deputy, that is natural.... As a result of this, certain proposals arose and we would now like to discuss these proposals. Let us discuss them normally. If there are constantly points of order and suspicions of something and so forth, then we will never make any headway in our work.

You can now propose some other candidate, please. But let us discuss this. I have the right after these consultations to propose to you the chairmen of the commissions and committees. And I want to say ahead of time that if they are approved then they themselves will organize their own office, to put it figuratively, their own deputies, secretaries and so forth. If they want to consult with me, please, I am ready to be an advisor on this but no more.

From the floor: Forgive me, but who gives this right? It is not set out in the Constitution. The right is given in the Constitution to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

A.I. Lukyanov: Mikhail Aleksandrovich [Bocharov], let me tell you again completely accurately and precisely. At the first session of the Soviet of the Union and at the first session of the Soviet of the Union which were both chaired by Comrade Gorbachev, we agreed and adopted a decision of the chambers which instructed the chamber chairmen to form the commissions. If one of the deputies does not remember this, that is something else. But such a decision was taken.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, let us begin to form the commission. Please.

From the floor: When we started the discussion here, at times the thesis was voiced that we should be concerned first of all with the interests of the Union. This is true. And I feel that the very name of our chamber is such and our tasks should be such. But what does this mean—the interests of the Union? I feel that the interests of the Union are basically the interests of the republics. But when we speak about this, such an opinion is immediately repudiated. That is completely wrong.

From the floor: This has long been the rule. These are the interests of all the republics.

From the floor: Just a second, I will finish. I say this because, for example, on the Planning and Budget-Financial Commission there are no representatives from certain republics, including Latvia. Then I begin to doubt what we mean by the interests of the Union. There are only three of us here, but it is essential to observe what we agreed upon, that is, there should be representatives of the republic on the commissions, at least on the main commissions.

Ye.M. Primakov: I agree with you and when one speaks about the interests of the Union then naturally we view this in the dialectical unity with the interests of the republic and that is quite natural. The interests of the Union cannot be based on the counterinterests of the republics. This is unfeasible and for this reason let us proceed from the view that no one should have any doubts on this level. Let us adjust the membership of the commissions. I propose that things be adjusted as we move along.

Now let us turn to the elections of the chairmen of our commissions. After long reflection, I would like to state outright, and after long argument even, we agreed on the candidate Comrade Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko for the post of chairman of the Planning and Budget-Financial Commission.

Do you have the bio sheet sent out about Comrade Kucherenko?

From the floor: Only his last name is given.

Ye.M. Primakov: Well then, I will acquaint you...of course, we are still learning to work together. Next time, when we vote, I promise you there will be biographic data sent out ahead of time. This has not been organized for now.

From the floor: I have a question: Would you tell us what candidates did you have? You said that you thought a great deal. We would like to know what other candidates there were? For example, I would like to know whether you reviewed Shmelev or Popov?

Ye.M. Primakov: I will answer your question. We reviewed many candidates but, unfortunately, we cannot make chairmen of the commissions and committees

those who are not deputies of the Supreme Soviet. Proceeding from this we would strongly urge that Petrakov be the deputy chairman of this commission. Petrakov is a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences and generally is one of our prominent economists and all economists know him. Incidentally, Comrade Bocharov, I would like to emphasize that I spoke with Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov and asked him to be a deputy on this commission. He refused. I would like to say that the conversations and rehashes and so forth went on for a long time. But, as they say, all of this came to nothing.

Now, on the question of Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko. He is presently the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Donetsk Oblast Soviet. When I began talking to him he said that he was not a person who would "rush" for this commission and felt that it would be better if he continued working where he was. But from all the responses which existed, from the work experience which he has, from his character, from his character traits which were mentioned by many persons who knew him well, he was precisely the man for the chairman of such a commission which really synthesizes all questions. He would like very much to work with science in this area. I in any event heard this from him and that he wants not a single budget question to be settled by arbitrary methods. He wants to see to it that all major questions are reviewed without fail by the executive bodies on this commission.

I have already said that the commission's work will of course involve prominent scientists and we will request that they participate in its work. Incidentally, I would like to say ahead of time that such comrades as Bunich and others will be working on other commissions. I asked Comrade Bunich to be a member of this commission but he stated that he preferred working on the commission for economic reform. As you can see, it was a reasoned purposeful discussion. Don't imagine that I am pulling things out of thin air. I now raise the question of Comrade Kucherenko. Who wishes to speak? Viktor Grigoryevich, please.

From the floor: Let him give his biography.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, Viktor Grigoryevich.

V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Donetsk Oblast Soviet (Donetsk-Kirovskiy Territorial Electoral District): I myself am from the Donbass and was born in Mariupol. I completed the Metallurgical Institute. I worked 15 years at the Mariupol Metallurgical Plant imeni Lenin and was the secretary of this plant's party committee. Later, I was the first secretary of the Ilichevskiy Party Raykom, where this plant is located. I worked on the city party committee and was chairman of the gorispolkom and secretary of the Donetsk Party Obkom as second secretary. At present, I am the chairman of the oblispolkom. That is my entire career. If one were to speak about deputy work, I was elected a deputy to the republic Supreme Soviet and worked there

on the budget planning commission, I headed the commission for industry and transport and recently was a member of the Presidium of the Republic Supreme Soviet.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there questions?

Auditorium: Let's vote.

Ye.M. Primakov: Someone wants to ask another question.

From the floor: What is the level of your economic education?

V.G. Kucherenko: I have understood your question. I understand all the necessity of having both an economic, legal and political education for the post of chairman of this commission. I am an engineer. And from my curriculum vitae your yourselves should judge what economic education I might have.

From the floor: For us now the most pressing problem is the question of the budget deficit. What is your view of this? What would you do to handle the budget deficit? That is the first thing. Secondly, what is your view generally of cost accounting and that the budget should be organized from the bottom upwards, that is the local budget, the republic budget and the Union, and not from the top downwards, as is presently the case. Thirdly, how do you as a man of the official apparatus, consider generally the problem of splitting the functions of party power and the state because you have been on both?

V.G. Kucherenko: The first question about the budget. You have me now, comrades, as it is difficult to answer all these questions because only 2 days ago did Yevgeniy Maksimovich propose me and only yesterday did we reach any unanimous opinion on this question. Possibly I cannot formulate all my views at once.

As for the budget and the deficit in it, we feel this in the oblast. In our oblast the budget deficit is 70 million. What is my view? Of course, at the congress many said that we are not living within our means, there was a major discussion of this and at the same time a predominant majority, if not all the speakers, made proposals for greater and greater expenditures. You all heard this, too. In various areas: for the family, for medical services, disabled persons and so forth. My view is as follows: before settling any question on additional outlays, we should decide where the money is to come from, where it is to be found, where it is to be earned, where it is to be obtained.

In terms of where the money is to be found now, of course, it is hard for me to formulate my position before such an audience. But we will have committees—14 committees and 8 commissions. Each commission will work and produce its own proposals and all of this will flow into the budget planning commission. Naturally, the budget planning commission will regulate the allocating of both the expenditures and the sources of income. I am a supporter of bringing the budget in

balance in the near future. Of course, we cannot make any progress just by talking.

Ye.M. Primakov: Well, any more...

From the floor: (Inaudible)

V.G. Kucherenko: Well, if you feel that I alone will balance the budget, I can say directly that you will not find this done by one man. But if you take the entire Supreme Soviet, in carrying out the congress decision (and we will be guided only by the congress decision), where it states directly in what manner and at what time this can be done, then we will be successful. We have no other way out.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

V.G. Kucherenko: I can tell you now that a draft decree is being prepared on territorial cost accounting and territorial self-management. I am a member of this commission. Comrade Vorotnikov heads it. We have examined the question twice. Not a bad draft and there there are points and positions which already determine the procedures for drawing up the budget. Of course, it is difficult to say directly until we have worked out the rates of deductions into the budgets. At this stage, we must clearly determine how the budgets will be drawn up on the spot and then the deductions into the superior budgets. This draft is almost ready and it will be brought up for nationwide discussion. And at present, of course, it would be difficult to give a final answer from this rostrum.

Ye.M. Primakov: Yes please...you have a question? Yes? Go ahead.

From the floor: I have a question. What is your attitude toward the ideas voiced in the speech of Deputy Shmelev? Do you agree with everything on improving our nation's economy and what would you add if you headed the Planning and Budget-Finance Commission?

V.G. Kucherenko: We should say first that it would be difficult to add to what was said at the congress and to the recommendations and requests. As for the speech of Comrade Shmelev, I should tell you that there is a grain of reason in practically all, in a predominant majority of his proposals that he voiced. The only thing with which I cannot agree is the proposal to further increase our overseas debt. Here I may be right or I may be wrong, but on this issue I have my stance. Why should we make any further requests to other states. I feel this is not fitting and should be stopped.

Ye.M. Primakov: Questions? Please.

M.V. Klimov, deputy chief physician at the Vyshnevolotskiy Central Rayon Hospital (Vyshnevolotskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kalinin Oblast): Well, having heard your reply, I got the impression when you began speaking...

Ye.M. Primakov: Do you have a question?

M.V. Klimov: Yes. A question about precisely the position of the candidate for the post of commission chairman. You said that at the congress we have planned a great deal precisely on the financing of social questions in addition.

V.G. Kucherenko: No, we did not plan but there were only proposals.

M.V. Klimov: Yes, rather proposals. Is it your position to reduce the budget at the expense of social questions or not? You can understand why I am asking this.

V.G. Kucherenko: In the first place, the proposals at the congress were not only on social matters but also other areas in increasing expenditures and reductions. You must realize that I do not think and I do not say and I will never say that there were attempts or motions to reducing or even not increasing expenditures on social needs.

From the floor: Now I understand. (Stir in the auditorium)

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, one last question. Please.

L.Ye. Bliznov: repairman at the Moscow Kerchief Production Association, Pavlovskiy Posad (Orekhovo-Zuyevo Territorial Electoral District, Moscow Oblast): I am not satisfied by Comrade Kucherenko's answer on the forming of the budget. One point from my pre-election program was to strengthen the power of the local soviets. And the main thing here is the forming of the budget. The local soviets are now impoverished and I would like the candidate for commission chairman to reply just how the budget would be formed, from the top downwards or from the bottom up?

V.G. Kucherenko: I will answer you. First of all, I do not want to be suspected that I am against the interests of the local soviets. Precisely on this commission I, by all my activities, will endeavor to establish conditions so that the local soviets capable of solving problems by their own financing will not come abegging as is sometimes the case. But it is difficult to say now how our budget will be formed when we do not know the reduction rates, we have not finally decided whether this will be from profits, from turnover or whether it will come from the enterprise funds; it is difficult now, you understand, to say how it will be formed and what the volume will be. There is just one goal to make the soviets independent.

Here there still are numerous questions. There are territories which do not have any large enterprises capable of providing them with much money while nearby is a territory which has numerous enterprises with a lot of money. Clearly the distribution should be made on the level of either the oblast or the republic and this is indispensable. Hence the question of forming the budget is a difficult question and we cannot approach it flippantly.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, permit me to run the meeting as we agreed. That was the last question and now there is a motion to move on to the voting. (Noise,

voices of "right"). Is there any discussion? Please. Who wants to speak? Not a question, but discussion please.

A.M. Yemelyanov, head of the chair of agricultural economics at Moscow M.V. Lomonosov State University (Leninskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): Comrades! I have nothing against Viktor Grigoryevich. This is the first time that I have seen him and, as they say, from Marxist dialectics, to judge externally, he is a very find fellow. I immediately favored him. But let us ask a question in principle.

We have very many commissions. Of all the commissions, probably this is the most professional commission, that is, finances. The complexities in this area are obvious. I would assume that a person who has great experience in life and who was both in party and Soviet work could be involved in labor and social questions. I am an economist with a university education. I have worked all my life in this area. Even if I were proposed such a situation now, I would not feel comfortable here. There is so much that you have to know, so much specific knowledge you must have.

All my life I have been amazed how Boris Ivanovich Gostev can be the nation's minister of finance. And has not the fact of the financial collapse of our system been due largely to the situation where a person, possibly honest and loyal to the party has been put in an area where he has very little understanding. Will we not be putting Viktor Grigoryevich [Kucherenko] into this difficult situation? We should give some thought to this as it is a very, very complicated problem. Certainly we could find a man who is professionally better trained for this.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades! In the first place, a commission will be working here. Secondly, there is the commission chairman and there also is the minister of finances. The latter is the executive body and the former is the legislative body. Understand this. These are completely different functions. We cannot now find a person to head the commission who would brilliantly know both the plan, the finances, the budget, the proportions in the national economy, the questions related to the local soviets to their functioning and so forth. There are no such universal geniuses. For this reason when we were choosing the candidates here, we proceeded from their experience in life, the honesty of the person and the principledness outlined, if you wish, in his program. And his program is aimed at having the Supreme Soviet be the head part of popular rule. We need like thinkers in this regard and not a narrow specialist who would have a brilliant knowledge of one specific question.

From the floor: Shall we vote?

Ye.M. Primakov: Now let us vote. Yes, please.

From the floor: I would like to have a word on the candidate proposed today for the post of chairman of this commission. I am a people's deputy and I do not possess the right of a deciding vote here. But I know

Viktor Gregoryevich Kucherenko for probably more than 15 years. I would like to say that he was the chairman of the executive committee of the city soviet in Mariupol, where at present the volume of industrial production is around 4 billion rubles. This is a city with a population of over 500,000 persons. This is a city with a diversified economy, a very difficult future and very serious problems, including in the development of the economy.

It must be said that while serving as chairman of the executive committee of the oblast soviet in Donetsk, Viktor Grigoryevich, in our view (and I represent the deputies from Donetsk Oblast here and would like to voice their opinion), gained sufficient practical experience in settling the involved questions of financing and developing the oblast and which has a volume of industrial production today of over 20 billion rubles. So, while agreeing with the comments made about him and in considering the objective shortcoming—the absence of an economic education—I would like to emphasize the presence of great practical experience.

I should tell you that Comrade Kucherenko by his nature is a very tenacious man in achieving the set goals. The tasks in the area of forming a local budget which were raised here by comrades from the Baltic Republic he knows, understands and, in our opinion, will worthily lead this commission. I would request that the deputies support this motion.

Ye.M. Primakov: There was a motion to vote.

From the auditorium: Yes.

Ye.M. Primakov: Wait a minute, wait a minute, I have not given you the floor. Just wait a minute. Either we will have order in the chamber or each person will merely come up and grab a microphone. What shall we do? Wait a minute. There was a proposal to vote. Do you have a comment? Then please say it.

D.V. Lisnichi, chief of a group for equipment repair at the Nikolayev Alumina Plant (Leninskiy Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): I would like to draw your attention, comrade deputies, to the questions asked of Viktor Grigoryevich who I have seen for the first time today. These are very complex and debatable questions. For example, I find very congenial the idea of our Baltic comrades as concerns the forming of budgets. But as a specialist I can say with full responsibility that the idea requires a thorough study. We are now endeavoring to gain a promisory note right away from a person appointed to such an important post. I feel that this is not very correct. To demand certain guarantees from a person being elected to a high post cannot be done in such complex questions. This must not be done. Otherwise, he will be bound by this obligation later on.

Ye.M. Primakov: What would you like to say, please.

From the floor. Comrades, I feel that the chairman of the Planning and Budget-Financial Commission is a very...

Ye.M. Primakov: Would you please introduce yourself.

A.I. Chabanov, general director of the Rotor Scientific-Production Association (Cherkassy Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): I feel that the election of the chairman of the Planning and Budget-Financial Commission is a very serious question since this commission encompasses the most diverse areas of our work. And it requires a very nonroutine approach. The problem is that the person should: in the first place, have his own strategy on how to find the money in order to defend it; secondly, comrades, there is another side to the question. For example, we have different areas. For example, the area of science. How is the money to be used and to whom will we give it? Hence, it is essential to organize a check. The money must be given to a specific individual because often our money is given out across-the-board. And if money is given to a sector then it is also given across-the-board. We are unable to surmount the departmental barrier.

I feel, and it is my opinion, that we must have a very strict approach to this matter. This should be an unusual, profoundly knowledgeable person who knows the gospel and so forth.

Here there is a docent from the economics chair, for instance, from the same Donetsk. Or there is a comrade who is the head of a section at the Economics Institute from Irkutsk. I would like to emphasize that this comrade could have an unusual approach but we must think about this thoroughly.

Ye.M. Primakov: Good. Comrades! I am halting the debates because a majority clearly is thus inclined. (Stir in the auditorium) Just a minute. I merely want to say that comrades, it is impossible to consider this matter as if someone could be suitable for the budget commission because he heads an economics chair. On the economics chair he could write a dissertation on industrialization or collectivization in 1929 and be the head of this chair without having any involvement in budget questions, in financing or anything else. In the given instance, I want to tell you again, we are choosing a person who by his qualities is fit to be the commission chairman. For this reason, I raise the question of voting. Those in favor will please raise their identity cards. Counters, would you please count.

(Votes are counted).

Hence, 181 for, 47 against and 12 abstentions.

Comrade Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko has been elected the chairman of the Planning and Budget-Financial Commission. (Applause).

From the floor: Just a minute please.

Ye.M. Primakov: No, wait a minute, wait a minute, and I will give you the floor. I would request all comrades who have certain questions on the membership of the

commission which is now headed by Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko to approach him and make the appropriate proposals. Please.

From the floor: Respected comrades, members of the Supreme Soviet! The point is that I am present here, like many others, with the right of a consultative vote in accord with that decree which you adopted yesterday. A most important question is being settled. Our right of a consultative vote consists in the fact that we do not have the right to vote but we should be able to state our viewpoint. You are turning our right of a consultative vote into a fiction.

Ye.M. Primakov: How so? Realize, if you were to count how many persons spoke and how many minutes this took, then it seems a very strange conclusion that this is being turned into a fiction. Let us move on to the organizing of the next commission.

From the floor: There are corrections on procedure.

Ye.M. Primakov: On procedure? Then please.

From the floor: The problem is, I feel, that here we are creating traditions by which our Supreme Soviet will work. The success of our work will depend upon what traditions we establish.

And at present we are establishing completely the wrong traditions. In world practice, Yevgeniy Maksimovich as a very experienced person should know this, that in discussing very important questions, and you would agree that the chairman of the plan and budget commission is an extremely important question for the nation, each person who so desires has the right to speak once. Only when the second speeches begin is the time set in any parliament. When it is over, there can be no more speakers. But in no parliament in the world is there a situation when a person is prohibited from speaking once on important questions. Only now in our country....

Ye.M. Primakov: Good. But let me tell you that there is a practice of parliamentarians in individual countries where a speaker can speak as long as he wishes. There is such a practice. He goes up to the microphone, everyone else leaves and he thus tries to draw out the discussion of the question. He has the microphone and no one has the right to interrupt and everyone leaves. At times, he can speak the entire night through and then the following day.

If you want, so to speak, to borrow everything from a bourgeois parliament, I feel that this is not suitable for us. We should create maximum opportunities so that everyone can state his opinion but let us not impose this opinion in such a manner and then not complain when others do not support it. Realize that a situation has already arisen here when some of the representatives in the minority, if you wish to put it that way, feel that democracy has been violated merely because their viewpoint was not adopted. This is wrong. It is simply wrong. For this reason let us work in a maximum productive

manner, let us work, in the first place, for the issues and not for the microphones and television sets and secondly let us work to adopt some decisions. (Applause).

I would like to move on to the next commission. We are discussing the Commission on Questions of the Development of Industry, Power, Equipment, and Technology. I can tell you that it was very difficult to select a candidate for the post of this commission's chairman. Our choice, and again against his desire was Vladimir Yegorovich Kurtashin who is presently the general director of the Kriogenmash [Cryogenic Machinery] NPO [Scientific-Production Association] (Moscow Oblast) and who has begun conducting very interesting experiments. Generally speaking, he is sufficiently trained both in scientific and technical terms and in economic terms, if you wish, because he is in charge of a very important experiment which goes beyond the limits of both the first and second model of cost accounting.

I have spoken with Comrade Kurtashin and have spoken with other candidates. Many agree that Comrade Kurtashin would be a good candidate in this regard. But here, you realize, completely different questions come together. Here are industry and power, equipment and technology. Here it is difficult to find a person who would cover all these questions, all these problems.

For this reason we feel that in the event that Comrade Kurtashin is elected, it would be possible to organize the appropriate subcommissions which would be headed by narrower specialists and would carry out policy in this area. Narrower both in terms of production methods, for industry, for power and for equipment.

So, let me introduce Comrade Vladimir Yegorovich Kurtashin, born in 1932, by nationality a Russian with a higher education. He completed the Tula Mechanical Institute and by educational specialty is a mechanical engineer and is now, as I have already said, the director...general director of the Kriogenmash NPO. Here we should say that he was promoted, the collective promoted him to this position and considers him a very skilled specialist. Please, Vladimir Yegorovich, come here.

Questions, let us have questions. And if some of those invited, and I particularly mean the deputies with a consultative voice, please have your say.

From the floor: Please tell us. At the congress a people's deputy stated that the space budget should be reduced and it should be turned over for social needs. What is your opinion?

V.Ye. Kurtashin: That is a very difficult question, in my view. I, as the general director of the Kriogenmash NPO, am interested in the development of space, because the contribution of our association to this area is very large. The second question. We are not utilizing our space technology. While America receives \$3 of profit per dollar, we now are just beginning to make available the package of advanced technologies for the national

ecology. I feel that we are a little behind in this area. There are good prospects for the sales of our space technologies overseas for large amounts and comrades present here know this. If we are able to realize all that is done in this area, we will receive large amounts of profit and will be the pacesetter in the development of the sector. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Questions, please. Do you want to vote? Are there persons wishing to speak?

Deputies: No.

Ye.M. Primakov: Questions, please.

From the floor: I would like to ask you what is your opinion of organizing within your commission subcommissions on the questions of the safety of industrial power units, nuclear power plants, regardless of ministries and departments? It seems to me that this is very important in light of the Chernobyl disaster and the disasters in Bashkiria. It is very important that there be independence in this work. What is your opinion?

V.Ye. Kurtashin: For me, as for the other comrades present here whom we have just elected, it would be probably impossible to outline completely a work plan for such a cumbersome commission. I feel that there will be 35 persons, we will draw up plans with them and then call in our institutes to also work. What you are proposing is, of course, correct. And if we monitor power and industry, without having our own subdivision which would be responsible for the safety of their work, then I feel such a commission should be set up under the Supreme Soviet. Of course, it must be established.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, it has been moved that we vote. Those against?

Auditorium: No.

Ye.M. Primakov: Those in favor of electing Comrade Vladimir Yegorovich Kurtashin as leader of the Commission on the Questions of the Development of Industry, Power, Equipment, and Technology, would they please raise their cards.

Who is against? I would like a count who is against and who abstains. Those against please raise their cards...I do not see any "nays." Abstentions? I do not see any abstentions.

Our congratulations, it is unanimous. (Applause).

And there will still be some who say that we chose poorly. (Laughter in the auditorium).

For the Commission on Questions of Transport, Communications and Information Science, we offer the candidate of Valentin Afanasyevich Tetenov. You have...forgive me, maybe not yet....

Auditorium: We have it.

Ye.M. Primakov: You do. I want to explain several questions related to the establishing of this commission. The question was correctly raised by Academician Velikhov that here we must somehow highlight information science, possibly, even moving it to the forefront. This is now really the problem of problems. In line with this, we are proposing that this commission include Comrade Tyugu from the Estonian Academy of Sciences and who is working actively on information science. He could head this part of it. Why have we stopped on the candidate of Comrade Valentin Afanasyevich Tetenov? Aside from the fact that he is actually well known, and the comrades recommend him well. He will be, if we elect him, the youngest chairman of a commission being born in 1947. He has a good knowledge of the transport area and again I would like to say that we were unable to find as commission chairman a specialist who, so to speak, is a jack of all trades. The transport area is extremely important for us and there there will be subcommissions headed by specialists of the corresponding area and the appropriate level and they will be in charge of both information science and communications. Thus, Comrade Valentin Afanasyevich Tetenov has been proposed. He is presently the first deputy chief of the Perm Division of the Sverdlovsk Railroad.

Is there a question, please? Just a minute, if there are questions, let us hear the person out.

From the floor: I have a question. I would like for you to briefly describe those problems which you see on this commission. The problems of data communications and transport.

V.A. Tetenov, first deputy chief of the Perm Division of the Sverdlovsk Railroad, Perm (Dzerzhinskiy Territorial Electoral District, Perm Oblast, RSFSR): Briefly, I can answer as follows. The permanent problems in all areas of transport are obvious. We must be more seriously concerned with transport than we presently are in order later not to have to save the situation as we now are doing in agriculture. Moreover, I also see problems which must be settled in light of the demands of today. We are preparing to convert to regional cost accounting but as yet we have given very, very little thought to how transport might operate under these conditions. For this reason the task of the new transport commission is to integrate the operations of rail and other types of transport into the Law on Regional Cost Accounting.

As for communications. At present, in providing the public with just telephone communications we are in our third decade and this speaks for itself. Information science is the sector of the future. It is also important for the railroaders for at least we should know where a certain freight is moving. This is an essential, important sector on this commission.

Ye.M. Primakov: Questions, please.

From the floor: Valentin Afanasyevich, you are an official from a department. From one of the strongest departments in our nation. You are already accustomed

to this department. How would you interact with it, in representing the presidency of one of our commissions?

Ye.M. Primakov: That is a very good question.

V.A. Tetenov: I realize how crucial the task is confronting the commission and me, as the candidate who must head the work of this commission. For this reason any departmental approach must be excluded. All questions must be viewed from the viewpoint that our nation feel real changes. This is how I would answer your question.

Ye.M. Primakov: This commission will also approve the minister. And there will be a very serious discussion and not just about the minister. They now hear and see me.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

Yu.T. Akbarov, driver from the Motor Vehicle Combine No 2, Tashkent (Tashkentskiy—Akmal-Ikramovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Uzbekistan): I am interested in the following question. At present, there is no national coordinating center for motor transport. Each ministry in each republic itself assigns the rates and so forth. What is your opinion now when a condensing of the ministries and departments is under way? What is your opinion on the establishing of a coordinating center for motor transport?

V.A. Tetenov: The question of a setting up of a transport committee which would include all types of transport such as motor vehicle, rail, water and so forth has long been under review, for at least 10 years. At present, motor transport has republic ministries. Just how effective it is to set up now a committee on transport, we must come back to this question and study it very thoroughly with the involvement of scientists and workers. And after this the decision should be taken. I cannot definitely answer your question now.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please, your question.

V.Ye. Karepin, machinist at the Kalinin Ulan-Ude Locomotive Depot of the East Siberian Railroad, Ulan-Ude (Ulan-Ude City Territorial Electoral District, Buryat ASSR): I have been recommended as a member of this commission. I have two questions. How correct does it seem to you to include such a section as information science in the competence of the commission. This is one question. The second question is and I assume that everyone is aware that the development level of the economy to a significant degree is determined by the development level of transportation.

V.A. Tetenov: To a large degree.

V.Ye. Karepin: In line with this I have the following question. At the congress in the reports and debates nothing was said about the state and prospects for the development of transportation. Is this not an expression

of the attitude of executive power to transport generally and is not the accident rate a consequence of such an attitude?

V.A. Tetenov: It is unquestionably a consequence of the attitude toward transportation. Beginning in 1965, rail transport alone did not receive R6 billion for its development as planned by the Council of Ministers and State Planning Committee [Gosplan]. At present, the railroad workers in particular are accused of many disasters, although there are weightier reasons for this.

I would say that Lenin gave transportation absolutely important significance from the very first days of Soviet power. Our ministry was headed by Krasin, Yelizarov, and Dzerzhinskiy. Krzhizhanovskiy was very attentive to the needs of rail transport. The attitude toward transport must be changed in the nation. I repeat, if we are not concerned with these questions now, we will have to rescue it as we are rescuing agriculture now.

A.V. Semenikhin, electric locomotive engineer from the Locomotive Depot of Tselinograd Station of the Tselina Railroad, Tselinograd (Tselinograd Territorial Electoral District, Kazakhstan): What is your attitude, your personal opinion, and what are the calculations of economists on the static load in rail transport?

V.A. Tetenov: It was not possible for me to give a speech at the congress but I turned a speech in. In particular, I would again repeat what was written there. In order for the national economy not to come to a halt, the ministry and the various ministry leaders during different years took irrational and extreme measures (which were forced and dictated by life itself) to increase the car load. In a gondola which previously carried 62 tonnes, it is now permitted to load 80 tonnes without any change in its design and without reinforcing the track. And what sort of safety margin is this if we are talking today about transport?

Ye.M. Primakov: A last question please.

F.M. Bulatskiy, political reviewer of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Moscow (from the Soviet Peace Fund together with eight Soviet committees working for peace, solidarity, and international collaboration): First of all, comrades, this is not a kolkhoz meeting. Here the deputies have the right to ask questions. I am not saying that each deputy has the right to state an opinion. We are not rushing anywhere. I have a serious question to understand and shape an impression of our comrade.

Tell us to what degree you are acquainted with experience in the area of transportation, communications, and information science in the leading industrial countries, such as Japan, West Germany, and the United States? In your opinion, how many years are we behind in this area and what do you think, if you thought about this, approximately how many years would it take us to catch up to their present level?

V.A. Tetenov: The specific operations of rail transport and transport generally in our nation differ sharply from many countries of the world. While in our country rail transport assumes 53 percent of all the cargo turnover, in the United States this figure is much lower. There maritime transport has priority and directly influences the national economy. For this reason it is scarcely advisable to compare at present rail transport of our country with other countries.

At the same time, our transport must develop. There are individual railroads and spurs in other countries of the world. They are simply being closed down. For this reason there transport is developing, possibly, in qualitative terms but not quantitatively. But I have not made any estimates. I feel that it would take more than a decade to catch up with the developed capitalist states.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there other persons wishing to speak?

Deputies: Enough.

Ye.M. Primakov: Then there is the motion to discuss. Are there questions? Please.

From the floor: I have the following question. Do you agree that in transport, particularly rail and air, our monopoly has reached extreme limits? If you agree, do you see ways for combating this very dangerous monopoly position?

V.A. Tetenov: It depends on what you see as a monopoly. If in the management system then I am ready to talk and hear other opinions. I feel that there should be centralization in transport due to the specific features of its operations. From the viewpoint of the economy, when rail transport has its own hospitals and schools and does not transfer a portion of its profits to the local budget, then these questions must be reviewed.

From the floor: I see monopoly in the fact, for instance, that inhabitants from the regions of the North are forced to accept any conditions which aviation transport offers. The inhabitants using rail transport are forced to accept any conditions in terms of service quality and transport price which transport sets.

V.A. Tetenov: We have rates which were set by the Council of Ministers. Possibly these actually do need an adjustment.

A voice: I would like to know whether you consider this a monopoly or not.

V.A. Tetenov: I have already answered this question and I will not add anything more.

Ye.M. Primakov: Would you like to ask a question?

N.V. Yefimov, brigade leader of assembly workers at the Vyksa Construction-Assembly Administration of the Specialized Stalkonstruktziya [Structural Steel] Trust, Gorkiy Oblast (Arzamas Territorial Electoral District,

Gorkiy Oblast, RSFSR): I represent an okrug where a year ago there was a rail explosion. I have a question for you, as a railroad worker. Do you have any opinion or, if you wish, a program to ensure the safety of freight shipments?

V.A. Tetenov: There are many of them, if it is a question of special freight. But again I repeat that abroad special freight is carried only in specialized rolling stock and is tested by striking a reinforced concrete wall. The container in which the freight is carried is heated to a strictly set temperature and only after this is moved. Unfortunately, we do not have such rolling stock at present and we are forced to transport this freight in conventional boxcars with security.

Ye.M. Primakov: Everyone, comrades, who wishes to speak, please.

From the auditorium: (Noise).

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

From the floor: Comrades! We are living not at the end of the 19th century but on the threshold of the 21st and for this reason the question is now, when we have established a commission where there is transport, where there is communications and information science, we should realize that if we do not make some contribution to solving these questions, none of our products will ever be competitive. We will be unable to enter into the world division of labor since the nervous system of this division—the communications network over which all transactions are carried out and over which information is disseminated—ends at the frontiers of the Soviet Union. We must resolve these questions. These are vitally important questions which determine whether we will be a developed country or whether we will move into another rank. I would say that, judging from the answers of Comrade Tetenov, it seems to me that he is weaker than the ministers we presently have. Substantially weaker. Professionally he simply does not only not know the questions of information science and communications but, in my opinion, he answered the transport questions very poorly. For example, the question of monopoly where we all know that the only world air company in which the service quality is declining is Aeroflot. You know the Dickensian conditions under which our citizens travel by rail. For this reason here we need a completely different level of a systems approach and reasoning generally. A second thing which bothers me. I will not speak by name about the commission members but of the 35 persons, 25 are transport workers. Again, you realize, it turns out that this commission is purely sectorial and will work with the sector, resolving its various minor problems. This bothers me enormously and for this reason I should say that, of course, the commission must be somehow broadened and subcommissions established. But it seems to me that we must search farther for a chairman. There have been proposals but I feel that from the viewpoint of a systems approach Anastas Ionovich Burachis could be considered as he has

spoken here at the Soviet of the Union and he is a member of the Soviet of the Union. Other persons could also be proposed.

Ye.M. Primakov: Here, comrades, we are again encountering an approach whereby Yevgeniy Pavlovich [Velikhov] naturally wants the commission to be headed by a specialist in information science. But others think differently. So, we must take a look here.

V.I. Kolesnikov, head of the chair at the Rostov Institute for Rail Transport Engineers, Rostov-na-Donu, Oktyabrskiy Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR: I am a member of this commission. Actually, information science is very important. And at present, as you know, 2 weeks ago the Soviet Government published an announcement that a fiber optics cable would be laid linking Europe and Japan. And actually the capabilities of this type of communication are extremely great. In 4 minutes it is possible to transmit the information in the entire American Library of Congress. If we do not make some move in this area, we will be centuries behind. But it seems to me that the election today of Valentin Afanasyevich Tetenov as the chairman of this commission does not mean that we are putting in his hands all three areas of transportation, communications, and information science. He is a young man who would head all these three subcommissions. As for him personally, I became acquainted with him at the congress. If you remember, in the initial draft there was no commission for transport. And then, due to the initiative, including the personal initiative of the proposed chairman, we now have this commission on transportation. For this reason I urge you to support this candidate.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are there others who wish to speak, please.

V.A. Boblikov, head of the organizational section of the Baltiysk CPSU Gorkom, Baltiysk (Chernyakhovsk Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): I have recently become interested in the questions of philosophy. It is a fact that the development of the world generally and the development of mankind is the development of information. So I had a look at the membership of the commission. The situation is such that at present in the world the one who holds leading positions in transportation and information will hold leading positions in the world, in technology and generally, as they say, in progress. For this reason the membership of the commission, frankly speaking, had a depressing impression on me. I would like to see persons who are better educated in this area. Because they will set our policy and hence our situation in the world.

From the floor: Let us raise the question of voting. Comrades, here we are examining a very serious question. Today I was struck even by the articles of certain academicians on the pages of the journal KOMMUNIST and who generally took a very flippant attitude to the fact that we lag substantially behind the entire world in the area of computers and information science. I feel that

we should already be living in the computer age. This still does not exist and the further we defer on this question the greater we will lag behind both in transport and in communications. The priority today is in the area of information science and the development of computers. I also am concerned that there are completely insufficient specialists precisely on this commission and we should take a look at who heads this commission, because a systems approach to solving these problems is very, very important. Here we need both transport and communications workers but information science and computers should hold the leading place.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, I want to say the following. When a commission is established as interdisciplinary, we will always witness clashes and definite interests. At present, it is perfectly clear that on this commission information science should be properly represented. We must do some work on the membership of this commission. This must be done without fail. But at the same time if the questions of transportation are not properly reviewed here, there will be no restructuring in the economy. This is perfectly clear. And this aspect of the matter should also be represented. And then, comrades, none of us is eternal in these places. Let us begin to work and later things will become clear. The leaders of the commissions can be replaced, and certain comrades can be promoted even during the work when they prove themselves to be excellent and possibly they will claim these posts with greater reason than we do. But let us now begin the work without thwarting this process. We must start now. For this reason I urge everyone to make his point within this context. Yes, please.

From the floor: About the commission membership. There are representatives of all....

Ye.M. Primakov: We are working on the membership.

From the floor: Except electric transport. There is not a single representative of municipal electric transport. And there are very many problems.

Ye.M. Primakov: Well, comrades, let us not concentrate on the membership. We will improve this as we go, we will consider all the opinions on this question.

From the floor: Comrades, we are listening to the candidates here and it seems to me that they should present at least a brief program of their activities and not answer our questions cautiously and evasively. Do you understand? One person presented a program and he was overwhelmed. Unfortunately.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

From the floor: Comrades, I support the candidate but this is not the only question. I would still like to take up procedural questions and our speeches. A comrade deputy spoke earlier here and compared our session of the Supreme Soviet with a kolkhoz. I feel that generally he greatly insulted the kolkhoz members and certainly he

should ask our pardon. Why? Because procedural questions... (applause) because procedural questions at a kolkhoz meeting are handled in no way worse than we do. There the organization is quite normal. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Alright. Yes, please.

From the floor: I apologize. Things don't always happen like you wish. I also side with Valentin Afanasyevich but I feel each of us has come here in being guided by just one thing, that is, to do everything so that in 5-10 years we have a powerful, developed, modern country. This is why we have come here. We, such a power, cannot be in such a state. This is a very serious question and with all sympathy that this question, the question of transportation, communications, and information science is an extremely major question. We should give some thought to this. I support the motion of Academician Velikov to review a second candidate. Let us hear a second candidate. This is a very serious question for our nation.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please. Did you want to say something?

From the floor: With all the importance of the problems in the lag of transportation and communications, the qualitatively important question is that information science at present represents $\frac{1}{3}$ of the basic resources: financial, labor and material resources in the most developed countries. Ultimately the effect of both transport and communications as well depends precisely upon the development of information science. And here precisely transportation and communications receive jointly approximately $\frac{1}{10}$ of what is now being channeled into information science. Information science presently determines not merely the potential which information science itself possesses. This is a question of hundreds of billions of rubles. Why? Because networks are established which are not filled with intelligence, are not filled with information, and it turns out that the computer networks stand idle. This is a problem of the effect of the defense potential, the problem of the effect of the entire economy and not merely individual sectors. For this reason I feel that we must have a qualitatively different approach to this extremely important problem. We can see that enormous resources have been allocated to the Committee for Computers and Information Science and to other organizations but no changes are occurring. The sole hope is now on an interagency special-problem commission which precisely on the level of the Soviet parliament could resolve these questions fundamentally and in a new manner.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, there is a motion to vote, there is a motion to defer. Let us vote. First who is in favor of voting now, would they please stand up. Thus, a predominant majority. Then I posed the question of voting for Valentin Afanasyevich Tetenov as chairman of the Commission for the Questions of Transportation, Communications, and Information Science. I would say again, comrades, that we will have numerous opportunities to change the membership of the commissions and promote persons who will join the leadership

and who will be properly concerned with information science. So, I request a vote. Who is in favor of the candidate? Who is against? Please count. (Count under way).

Who abstains? Please count. (Count under way)

There are 36 against and 12 abstentions. A majority is in favor of electing Comrade V.A. Tetenov as the commission chairman. (Applause).

Now, let us consult. We have to elect one more commission on the questions of labor, prices, and social policy.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: No, please wait. I want merely to say that Nikolay Nikolayevich Gritsenko has been recommended as the chairman of this commission. He is a professor, doctor of science, he is concerned with these questions professionally, he has won very high regard for his deeds and is a person who thoroughly understands how important these questions are.

Possibly, we should hear him now only let us do this considering that the conditions will naturally be further examined both in terms of membership and leadership.

Comrade Gritsenko, please. Are there questions for Nikolay Nikolayevich Gritsenko? You have a question? Please.

From the floor: In the course of the discussion at the congress, there were very alarming words on the existing situation in the area of realizing the right to work in a number of regions of our nation, in particular, the Central Asian Republics and certain others. I would like to know your opinion on these problems, are they known to you? How serious are they and what ways do you see for solving them?

N.N. Gritsenko, rector of the higher school for the Trade Union Movement Under the N.M. Shvernik Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], Moscow (from the USSR Trade Unions): Like you, I heard all the questions which the deputies raised. There are very many problems here concerning labor, social questions, and prices. Probably there are more of these than all others. Certainly, this commission should draw up a list of problems and examine their priority along with you. If one speaks about the employment problem, this is a very great and very complex problem. I share your concern. It is of enormous significance primarily for the republics. But at present, surplus manpower has already appeared in other regions. For the first time, we released a million persons last year. For this reason, here there should be a very serious study of the question of developing the structure of the enterprises and sectors in the regions having surplus manpower in order that they not merely be a raw material appendage. We must develop the manufacturing sectors in them so that there be not only seasonal production but year-round employment. This is one of the ways. A second way is, if this agrees with the interests of the people, to possibly move into other areas where

there is a manpower shortage. In any instance, this commission should have under strictest control the work of the system of job placement and guaranteed job bodies.

Ye.M. Primakov: Are you satisfied with the reply to the question? Yes? Good. Are there other questions? Please.

From the floor: Respected Nikolay Nikolayevich! Again I have questions on the problem of the disabled and their job placement. Having carefully studied the decree on the main report, I would like to incorporate many questions there. We have submitted these in writing. And yesterday Comrade Zaslavskiy raised one of the main questions. So I have one question for you. Can we in our chamber jointly resolve the questions of jobs for the disabled? First there is the lifting of restrictions on the so-called "ceiling" of pensions for the disabled in order to let them work and have a relatively good family budget. Secondly, to allow the public disabled organizations to run their own budget. I have in mind the payments. To partially make their payments to the local soviets and not to the republic budgets. We would like to hear a more affirmative reply to this than we heard before. Thank you.

From the floor: I feel that a final solution to these questions should remain for the Supreme Soviet but I also consider it my duty to support the motions. Time will tell how they are finally resolved by you.

From the floor: I have a brief question. I feel that we, and not a single speech was devoted to this at the congress, are investing little in the basic precious baggage of future restructuring, that is, the children. What do you think, in the future will we be able to pay a minimum salary in the nurseries and creches to the attendants and nurses who look after our children? Can we not invest more there? I, for example, feel that we must turn things around quickly if we intend to have good, well-raised children.

N.N. Gritsenko: I feel that generally speaking we must by priority invest money into the social sphere. During the pre-election campaign, when I was being asked questions and I was studying the literature, I discovered terrifying figures. We invest a ruble in the material elements of the productive forces but we invest only 15 kopeks into the human factor. This is while there is R1 per ruble in the developed countries. In speaking about children, this, in my mind, is the first object for investing our capital investments. We should certainly establish the concepts "economy of health," "economy of education" and "economy of childhood" because these are the most advantageous spheres for investment. In speaking the language of the economist, I am no longer talking about the human, humane aspects of the question. But there are two viewpoints here. One is, as you propose, to give more money to persons taking care of children. But there is also another viewpoint raised by women and we must thoroughly examine it. And this is to pay money to the mother raising a child and consider the time spent on

tending the child as labor employment. For this reason we certainly must compare these viewpoints. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Good, please.

From the floor: Nikolay Nikolayevich, as is known, the prices for certain medicines, particularly imported ones, in our nation are such that a complete course of treatment sometimes costs more than a month's pension. How do you feel, in what direction here, from your viewpoint, should we proceed: either in the direction of reducing the prices for medicines, or in the direction of increasing wages and pensions; or in the direction of insurance coverage, using the insurance and social funds, for covering the expenses of all citizens on outpatient treatment, because at present we have insurance coverage only for inpatient treatment.

N.N. Gritsenko: I feel that this is also a question which we must study thoroughly. I support the viewpoint that any law or any decision should have the foresight and estimate the economic and social consequences of the decisions taken. But if one proceeds from general principles, I feel, that our medical services should be gratis. At the same time, since we have public funds, from these public funds the better-off portion of the population receives a greater share than the less provided for and so thought must be given to what coefficients or surcharges could equal out this social injustice. Hence, possibly, for a separate category there should be benefits for medicines, in particular, for the disabled, for the elderly and so forth. For others, possibly, there should be a different price level. But any event, all these proposals should be thoroughly studied by us and an optimum solution found.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

From the floor: I want to make a motion. I have known Nikolay Nikolayevich almost 30 years and I will vote for him. I would like to emphasize that he is a man of high culture and erudition, very democratic and I feel that he will handle this post confidently.

Ye.M. Primakov: Questions, please.

From the floor: I would like to ask a question which will probably be of interest to all the chemists of the nation. At present, in discussing the new pension law, there are plans to increase the length of employment in retiring on pension for men and women according to a preferential list. The problem is that the situation in chemistry has virtually remained unchanged over the last 30-40 years. I ask the question: What is your position on this question? Your viewpoint?

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

N.N. Gritsenko: You are asking my viewpoint about retiring early, on a pension, yes?

From the floor: On the need to work a longer time than at present according to the detrimental list, that is, if men now work 10 years in order to retire on pension at age 50,

then 15 years are planned. Women work 7.5 years and they plan 10 years. I am now giving the figures somewhat arbitrarily, because there is a discussion under way but in the given instance this economically harms their interests. And at the same time, I say, that in chemistry the situation has not improved for the better from the health standpoint. What is your viewpoint of this?

N.N. Gritsenko: I cannot now comment on this concrete example. This certainly must be reviewed. I am in favor of the most careful review and adoption of a law on pensions and carrying out the congress decisions which we adopted yesterday, without waiting for the congress decisions, the decisions for introducing a pension law, to settle the question now of poorly-off families. As for the specific cases with chemists, miners, and workers in other professions, certainly the commission should review this, but I would always be on the side of those who need protection, that is, the interests of the workers.

Ye.M. Primakov: It has been moved that we vote. Who is in favor of electing Nikolay Nikolayevich Gritsenko, the chairman of the Commission on Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy, please vote. Who is against? I do not see anyone against. One against. Abstentions? Two persons have abstained, and one is against.

Thus, Comrade Gritsenko is elected commission chairman. (Applause).

With this our session is closed. The next session is a joint one of the two chambers and will be held at 1600 in this auditorium. Thank you all.

Second Sitting

10 June 1989, USSR Supreme Soviet Hall of Sessions in the Kremlin. 1330.

Comrade R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presiding.

R.N. Nishanov: Please be seated. Let us begin our work.

Comrade deputies, this is our second sitting, and today we must review the questions of the deputy chairman of the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities as well as the membership of the commissions which we have formed. I would like to turn the floor over to Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov so that he can briefly inform us on how we have approached the preparing of this question.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, I would like to inform you that a sitting of the Soviet of the Union has just been held. First, what was agreed on by the Soviet of the Union was that we will follow the procedural rules of the Supreme Soviet which have already been adopted. If we are not satisfied with something, then a chamber can make certain motions to work out a new general procedural rule of the congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. But these procedural rules have already been tested, and to a significant degree they make it possible to resolve questions, as they have now permitted us to solve questions in the Soviet of the Union.

Second, as you recall, at our first sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities we instructed the chamber chairmen themselves, having consulted with the deputies, with the deputy groups from the republics and regions, to be concerned with the question of selecting candidates for the position of deputy chairmen of the chambers and the chamber commissions as well as the committees. I would say that there was enough time for this and the comrades have carried out this work. Today in the Soviet of the Union they elected four commission chairmen and the chamber chairmen reported in detail on each. Thus, the congress Presidium has assigned this work to the chamber chairmen and you instructed them at our first sitting.

R.N. Nishanov: Are there any questions for Anatoliy Ivanovich?

From the auditorium: No.

R.N. Nishanov: No, then let us begin.

According to Article 111 of the USSR Constitution, we must choose two deputy chairmen of the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities. As you recall, at the first separate sessions of the chambers, the chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities were instructed on the basis of consulting with the delegation representatives, to draw up these proposals. As Anatoliy Ivanovich has said, we have held the consultations. Here we were aiming primarily at the preparedness of the comrades, the necessity of representation of different regions, considering the nature of our chamber. Such an approach applied not only to the deputy chairmen but also to the commission chairmen and their deputies. We endeavored to make maximum consideration of the interests of all the republics, regions, autonomous formations, and so forth. Naturally, time did not permit the holding of wide consultations. The proposals drawn up are submitted for your consideration. Due to the fact that during the sessions of our chambers and during the joint sessions, the request was made that one of the deputy chairmen be of the distaff side, a good half of our deputy corps, during the consultations we considered this aspect. And so the first for your consideration is the motion to elect as the deputy chairmen of the Soviet of Nationalities the Deputy Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya, a weaver from the 60-letiy Velikoy Oktyabrskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii Ukrainskoy SSR Zhitomir Flax Combine. You have brief biographic data on Vanda Sergeyevna. Or would you like to hear from her yourself? You would, yes? Well, Vanda Sergeyevna, if you please.

From the floor: Is it possible to ask a question?

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

B.N. Yeltsin, (Moscow City National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): We were not given an opportunity at the congress, to have alternate candidates in electing the various officials, proceeding from the fact, as is stated in the constitution, that the chairman of the

Supreme Soviet submits the candidate. But here, in the chamber, why do we not have the opportunity to choose from alternate candidates? We are constantly being told that there were alternate candidates somewhere along the line. You discussed, you had five or six persons so that there were alternate candidates for you, but we, the deputies, did not. You again are proposing just one candidate. Give us an opportunity to submit a second or third candidate for the deputies and other positions, including the commission chairmen and so forth.

R.N. Nishanov: Thank you, Boris Nikolayevich. First of all, I would like to say that, in the first place, we have not yet discussed the question of alternate candidates. If the need arises then we will discuss this.

Please.

T.A. Minnullin, writer and chairman of the board of the Tatar ASSR Writers Union, Kazan (Kukmorskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Tatar ASSR): At the session of the Council of Elders, I proposed that one of the deputies be from an autonomous republic or an autonomous oblast. Why was this not taken into account? This question is more serious than we think, comrades, because without the autonomous republics the union republics can scarcely resolve their own problems. I feel that we will repeatedly come back to this question so let us take the proposal seriously.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Minnullin, when we were first consulting and preparing the motions, we considered the representation of the autonomous republics including which candidate would be on a commission and which on a committee. These questions were considered. But if you have some specific proposals then we are ready to examine them. We have assembled for this purpose. Now my motion is for Comrade Venglovskaya. If there are questions for Comrade Venglovskaya, please let us know. If there are other candidates, we will also discuss them. Please, you have a question?

From the floor: Respected Comrade Chairman! I would like to ask a question. Does the educational level of the proposed candidate for the post of deputy chamber chairman play a role? The second question is for Vanda Sergeyevna, does she study by correspondence?

R.N. Nishanov: First of all, the educational level of any other qualification for election as deputy chairman has not been set and is not to be set. We are all deputies of the Supreme Soviet, people's deputies, we all have the same rights, the same duties, and each is worthy of holding any position. Please, now you, Vanda Sergeyevna, answer the questions.

V.S. Venglovskaya, textile worker from the 60-letiy Velikoy Oktyabrskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii Zhitomir Flax Combine, Zhitomir (Zhitomir National-Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): Respected deputies, I am not studying. I completed 10th grade and have worked 23 years as a textile worker. I have worked well, honestly and conscientiously. I was elected a deputy

of the city soviet. I want to say the following. Of course, all of you, the people's deputies, would like for the deputy to be a woman with a higher education without fail, because for some reason workers are not always accepted. But I know life well, I know the working class and the life of this milieu. I have been honest, good neighborly and tenacious all my life.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question.

From the floor: Please tell us, Vanda Sergeyevna, how you yourself feel—are you ready to carry out such a serious function?

V.S. Venglovskaya: You know what I would like to say: I would not assume such a major function by myself. We, the people's deputies, here have the same rights and without your aid, of course, I would get nowhere. We will settle everything together.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question.

From the floor: I would like to ask the following question. How do you see the establishing of a Law on Citizenship in the Union Republics and Autonomous Oblasts? In our opinion, this would help, in the first place, indirectly to replace extensive development by intensive and, secondly, control migration. What is your opinion on the Law Governing Citizenship?

V.S. Venglovskaya: If I were to speak honestly, I do not know all the laws well. But I feel that no nation in any way should be belittled.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please your question.

From the floor: Forgive me, but I will again ask a question of a procedural nature, because the position of deputy chairman of the chamber is 75 percent procedural. When I asked Rafik Nishanovich [Nishanov] about this, he gave me a completely exhaustive reply about rotation. In principle, Rafik Nishanovich has agreed to retire in a year. Would you agree to do this, Vanda Sergeyevna? For the sake of equal representation of the republics?

V.S. Venglovskaya: Yes.

R.N. Nishanov: So, please, your question, Comrade Kugultinov.

D.N. Kugultinov, writer and chairman of the board of the Kalmyk ASSR Writers' Union, Elista (Iki-Burulskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Kalmyk ASSR): I do not have a question but a motion. When one speaks about the reasons for the promoting of one or another candidate for the post of deputy chairman of the chamber, I feel that the issue of sex is not serious as an argument. When Thatcher was elected it was certainly not because she was a woman. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Well, the women deputies have raised this question at the chamber sessions and at the congress. And I think that our women do have a sexual-based right

to promotion and our chamber must not infringe upon this right. Please, your question.

Voice from the auditorium: (Inaudible).

From the floor: We must define the functions of the chairman more precisely and then we will settle this question.

R.N. Nishanov: The chamber's functions are determined by the Constitution. The person who is elected to this post will, along with you and in accord with the provisions of the Constitution, carry out his functions.... So, please, your question. Withdrawn? Comrade Likhanov, please.

A.A. Likhanov, writer and chairman of the board of the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund): Vanda Sergeyevna, I bear complete respect for you and would like to ask the following question. Can you not foresee that you, as the deputy chairman of the chamber, may once have to participate in settling some interethnic conflict? Can you find in yourself the qualities which will make it possible for you to carry out this difficult political and moral work? Here we today and during the days of the congress have heard a good deal about these disasters and are you ready for this work?

V.S. Venglovskaya: Of course, with your aid, I think that I certainly can.

R.N. Nishanov: Please. What are the motions? To vote? Would anyone like to say something? Please.

From the floor: I with satisfaction will vote for you because from our history I know what figures our women have been in the state. But I would like to know: Are you acquainted with the events of Nagornyy Karabakh and Sumgait, with the tragedy of Sumgait?

V.S. Venglovskaya: Of course I am familiar. From the press I know and understand what a complicated situation there is there now and I feel that we must resolve this question.

R.N. Nishanov: Just a minute, comrades. Please, Anatoliy Ivanovich.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, I want to inform you about one question which arose in the Soviet of the Union. There also a number of candidates were submitted and the deputies began testing each candidate with the following test: How do you relate to some interethnic conflict? And ultimately at the session of the Soviet of the Union they concluded that as long as the commissions set up by the congress are at work, as long as they are concerned with these questions, our comrade deputies should not be put to this test.

R.N. Nishanov: I feel that this is reasonable. Correct? Please, your question.

From the floor: Respected comrade deputies, I represent women but today, when we are electing the deputy chairmen of the Soviet of Nationalities, when we still know one another very little and considering the complexity and the acuteness of the interethnic questions, it seems to me that this post should be filled by a person better known in all the Union republics and in the Union who would have authority and whose ideas we already know. I feel that it would be possible to find such women among the deputies of the Soviet of Nationalities.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please, who wants to speak?

Your proposals?

From the floor: Comrade deputies, I feel that this is a substantive question.

R.N. Nishanov: Please introduce yourself.

G.S. Igityan, general director of the Republic Center of Aesthetic Education and Director of the Modern Art Museum of Armenia, Yerevan (from the USSR Artists' Union): The question is in no way that we are against a textile worker being the deputy chairman of the chamber as we are all equal and all deputies have been equally elected by the people. My question does not concern what job a person performs. The question is that we live at the end of the 20th Century, there is the concept of competence and there is a concept of the authority of people who must direct problems which arise before our society. Possibly, this is a great person, a fine textile worker, and I have nothing against her. But these are not the 1920s, when a sailor was given the keys and told: "You will direct a bank." At present, the situation in the nation is very serious and we are all aware of this. Moreover, I cannot help but say, Rafik Nishanovich, I cannot help but say this because my heart has been breaking for several days and I cannot help but blame you that at present there is a very complex situation in Uzbekistan as the correspondents are telling us. How can you calmly sit there, being the secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee and say: "Calmly, comrades, everything will be alright, we will catch this and do everything." For me, there is the concept of the leader of a nation. For me, this was, for instance, Masherov in Belorussia who in the partisan detachments liberated his land of Nazism, that is, he was in a most extreme situation. We know another example of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov who worked around-the-clock in an extreme situation. I simply cannot understand that if we have met here today in order to make major changes in the life of the nation, if we are all concerned...

R.N. Nishanov: Your proposal?

G.S. Igityan: My proposal is either for all of us to work seriously or have the dignity and honor to say: comrades, we are disappointed, clearly this is not what we expected nor what the press or all the mass information media prepared us for. So, whoever has a conscience, let us quietly go home. This is my proposal: you immediately

leave for Uzbekistan. Anatoliy Ivanovich can conduct the meeting of the Soviet of Nationalities. Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: Sit down. I am here at your will, you chose me and for that reason I am here. I must conduct this meeting in order to form our leading bodies, elect the deputy chairmen and set up our commissions. Then I will carry out my duty. For your information, for 2 days, for as much time as I was able, I did go there, I visited all the points and met with everyone: with the Meskhetian Turks and with the Uzbeks. Those measures which were necessary to be taken in the republic, I took in the republic and those which had to be taken while here, I took here. Here we have had numerous meetings with the Meskhetian Turks, including one this morning. Together with the Union bodies we are settling many questions. For this reason, I reject this portion of your comments and as for whether we are working seriously or not seriously, I would ask you yourself to be more serious. We are discussing serious questions.... Please, Comrade Azizbekova.

P.A. Azizbekova, director of the Azerbaijan History Museum, Baku (Baku-Azizbekovskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Azerbaijan): I, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Corps of People's Deputies, support the candidacy of Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya. I will not dwell on her qualifications since we all have these papers. I feel that she is profoundly right that we must set aside the question of the NKAO [Nagornyy Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] at present, during today's discussion of her candidacy. At present, it is difficult for her to answer this question, just as it is for each of us. Any nationality question is so complex, so delicate and fragile that it must not be left to sulk about for a day or two or at some forum. I feel that the congress adopted the correct decision and turned this over to our committees on interethnic relations. We are analyzing, we are studying and we will help Comrade Venglovskaya also. I feel that she is a good candidate. As for such tenacious proposals about the NKAO, our opinion is that a group of comrades wants to divert the attention of our congress to this question and, honestly speaking, it is even a shame for us that we have taken up so much of the time of the congress. Our delegation supports the candidacy of Venglovskaya.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrades, let us deal specifically with the candidacy, because at present it is not our function to analyze any questions. Please, your proposal.

Yu.Y. Kuplyauskene, chairman of the Student Trade Union Committee at the Vilnius Construction Engineer Institute, Vilnius (Vilnyusskiy—Dzerzhinskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Lithuania): I feel that at present questions are being raised that the autonomous oblasts, the autonomous republics and national minorities of the Soviet Union are not being represented. In our history there has never been a case when there was a representative of the Far North and we, the Lithuanians are proposing Yevdokiya Aleksandrovna Gayer, from the Far Eastern Electoral District. She is a co-worker at

the Institute for the History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Far Eastern Division of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Vladivostok. (Applause).

(A deputy identifies himself indistinctly.) I would also like to make the same motion as the previous deputy. Considering the complexity of the questions of interethnic relations, we should propose someone of the deputies, so to speak, of the small-numbered peoples, as we are now beginning to switch to this term instead of small peoples.

R.N. Nishanov: Well, your question please. Your proposals.

M.L. Bronshteyn, head of the chair at Tartu State University, Tartu (Tartuskiy—Sovetskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Estonia): I feel that the arguments which have been given about being a specialist are very important since we, as is apparent, are unfortunately going to be shaken by these questions. And here we must have a person who does not represent a small or large people or does not represent a certain district. We need a person who is able to integrate, with profoundly scientific knowledge on this question and at the same time who has high human qualities. All of you certainly have heard the speech on interethnic relations by Klara Khallik, she is from Estonia, but in no way does she represent the narrow interests of her own or any other single republic. She is a major specialist, the specialists have viewed her comments correspondingly and she is a person of high moral qualities. And I feel that if they want women represented, that is fine with me. I feel that she will be the best candidate. That is my opinion. It is up to you to decide.

R.N. Nishanov: Does anyone else have a proposal? Comrade Safiyeva.

G. Safiyeva, poetess, chairman of the Tajik Republic Division of the Soviet Culture Fund, Dushanbe (from the Soviet Culture Fund): I liked Vanda Sergeyevna very much. Even a person's appearance shows how spiritually rich a person is but, do you know, I cannot agree with this candidate. Not because she is a textile worker, that is all well and good. But I would support the motion by Comrade Minnullin. Comrades, if we in fact are internationalists, if we want to save (and now, for goodness sake, let us not say small peoples) the small-numbered peoples, then the representatives of these peoples should not only be members of our chamber but also among the deputy chairmen. Vanda Sergeyevna can be a committee member.

Now I want to say this. This is a person who will be involved in the fates of not only the small-numbered but also large peoples. For example, I, as a deputy from the Soviet Culture Fund, am greatly concerned for our cultural heritage. I am hoping that at this congress we can solve at least one question concerning language and the status of state languages. This also has not been settled. I myself would not be competent for this and I

am not certain that Vanda Sergeyevna would be competent for this. For this reason I would like to see in the post of deputy chairman a person who could answer those questions which are of great concern for me. To speak honestly, Comrade Nishanov gave an incomplete answer to my questions and Vanda Sergeyevna could not reply even more. For this reason let us be serious about this. We are all deputies and we should choose people who in fact can come to our aid when we are having a difficult time, when it is hard for us. And at present it is very difficult, very painful for us.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please.

L.M. Veyser, secretary of the Komsomol committee at the Sasanchi, Kazakhstan, Dzhambul Oblast, Kurday-skiy Rayon, Masanchi Village Secondary School (from the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League): Respected comrade deputies! I feel that at present the question we are discussing is very important. It is also my opinion that here one must not only be educated but also have a feeling of tact as we are in the Chamber of Nationalities. I feel that the person proposed to us should have not only competence but should also have a special approach to resolving the various problems, particularly as at present the nationality questions are very acute for us. I feel that Vanda Sergeyevna would do with our help. Where things are misunderstood, where things would be difficult for her, we will help her and this is why we have assembled here. We, the people of Kazakhstan, support her candidacy. This is one issue. Now on a procedural question. Here I fully support Boris Nikolayovich [Yeltsin]. Possibly, comrades, we will be satisfied by the proposal of one candidate and having them tell us: "We on the presidium have discussed, we have decided this, and are offering for your review one person." Today I carefully followed the session at the Chamber of the Soviet of the Union and I felt ashamed and awkward for the person who several times "steam-rolled things through." I was also very ashamed that we vote by such a primitive voting method, when the chairman counts with a pen. Forgive me, comrades, but scraps of paper should no longer have to be used. In taking advantage of the occasion I would request of Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov] that at the next session or congress this auditorium be properly equipped. Let us get rid of this method of proposing one candidate and voting automatically.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your proposal.

M.A. Mikheyev, brigade leader of the interdisciplinary brigade at the Uglestroy-1 [Coal Construction] Construction Administration of the Yakutuglestroy [Yakut Coal Construction] Combine in Neryungri (Neryungri National-Territorial Electoral District, Yakut ASSR): What bothers me? Here there has been a statement by scientist deputies that a worker should not be admitted. This makes me mad. If you are scientists then help the workers. What are you saying, that our place is somewhere in a coal mine? How should we understand this? I support this candidate. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Fine, your proposal.

B.S. Safarov, shift engineer from the aviation maintenance facility at Kulyab Airport, Kulyab, Kulyab National-Territorial Electoral District, Tajikistan): When the socialist state was founded, there were no incompetent people. Many of those who were scientists did not want to work. And at that time precisely the workers were involved in running the state. The fact that Vanda Sergeyevna does not know a great deal, does not understand much and that there will be difficulties, I feel, cannot be considered her fault, because here many of us also do not know anything. Yes, there will be difficulties. But if there among us scientists, if there are among us statesmen who worked preciously, then they will understand this. At present, we have turned to Leninist principles and want to create a state which had been created during his time. In order that all people be heard, it is essential that a person from the milieu of these people now be placed here. Later he will learn everything and everything will go normally. The scientists and statesmen who are among us now should help her and I think everything will be settled. For this reason I urge all to vote for Vanda Sergeyevna, but if things have already reached the point of alternate candidates, then possibly two candidates should be put up for voting. Let us vote, let us analyze.

R.N. Nishanov: This is natural. All the candidates will vote. I am giving you the floor now...I still want to say, dear comrades, that at the first session we did say that there would be both rotation and changes. We all will be given the opportunity to take an active part in these processes, and for this reason I would not complicate the question. Each person has his right, each has his own approach, his own position. Our concern is to work out a uniform position. Please.

P. Badalbayeva, chief physician at the Shakhrisabzskiy Central Rayon Hospital, Kashkadarya Oblast, Shakhrisabz, Uzbekistan (from the Womens' Councils Under the Soviet Womens' Committee): Respected deputies! We, the women, are represented in the Supreme Soviet by just 30 percent and at the congress little attention was paid to our women's problems. Due to the shortness of time, we were unable to make our problems known. Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya has experience in life. She is a textile worker. Regardless of the fact that she has a secondary education, she speaks very forcefully. Of course, if we, the deputies, support her here she will handle this job. For this reason I, as a deputy from the Womens' Councils, support the candidacy of Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya.

R.N. Nishanov: Fine, please.

V.V. Yakushkin, instructor at the Secondary Vocational-Technical School No 147, Vitebsk (Vitebsk City National-Territorial Electoral District, Belorussia): I feel that we, speaking figuratively, are presently in an aircraft. We have selected our captain, that is you, Rafik Nishanovich. Now we are selecting the navigators, the

assistants, the co-pilot. We are all passengers. We will determine where we are going and at what speed. It seems to me that if in the course of the flight someone asks how something is done, this is not quite right. Here it seems to me that the solution should be very sound, because the captain can be out of commission and then the co-pilot must take over. Here we must discuss everything thoroughly.

From the floor: Two words, if possible?

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

From the floor: Comrade deputies, we now, in my view, are wasting time. And time must be spent on the essentials. At present, unfortunately, the workers, scientists, weavers and ministers are at loggerheads. But this is not the issue. We are choosing our Soviet power. We are choosing the deputy chairmen of the Soviet of Nationalities. The chairman of Rafik Nishanovich. He could go on leave. He could ultimately—let us all hope that he is healthy and lives long—fall ill. We are choosing a deputy captain or pilot, as they say, and for this reason it is not the educational level (although this is very important), not the vocational qualifications (this is also very important) but rather the civil position, the ability to resist, when this is necessary, this is what we need in selecting not only the deputy chairmen of the Soviet of Nationalities but also generally in electing all of our committees and commissions. I do not agree with the worker—and I am a worker also—who said that I will choose her only because she is a worker. Let us get on with our business and not clash.

If my opinion were to be asked, I personally do not see in this candidate a political and state figure however winning a woman she may be.

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

From the floor: I would like to ask where that fable came from that under Lenin the government had workers and peasants who could not manage anything? Lenin had highly skilled specialists and it was the intelligentsia who along with Lenin ran the Soviet of People's Commissars. For this reason I have the following proposal. Disregarding women, the small peoples and anyone else. We need to elect a statesman and I propose Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your proposal.

From the floor: Comrades, it seems to me that we have assembled here, we have very many men here, and we have heaped all the burden of the questions which must be solved on the shoulders of just Vanda Sergeyevna. What will the rest of us do? I propose voting. I personally will vote for Vanda Sergeyevna.

R.N. Nishanov: The motion has been made to vote. We have a candidate and we will vote. Each has his right. Let us begin voting, yes?

From the auditorium: Yes!

R.N. Nishanov: Good, let us begin voting. (Stir in the hall). We have already raised the question of voting. Excuse me, but a majority is in favor of this.

From the floor: I also offer my excuses, but we do not elect a leader every day.

R.N. Nishanov: But we have already been listening, we have held discussions. A majority moves that we vote. For this reason I move that we vote as the first step. (Stir in the auditorium). Just a minute, just a minute, please.

From the floor: How many deputies do we need?

R.N. Nishanov: There will be two deputies. You have already been sent out the preliminary materials.

From the floor: Now there are three candidates, are there not?

R.N. Nishanov: Since at the very outset we agreed that one of the deputies would be a woman, we are now discussing the candidate woman for this post. For the other deputy—and you have the proposal—we propose a specialist, a prominent specialist, a lawyer, doctor of sciences and very experienced professor from a Baltic Republic. We will get to this question. We were simply obliged to heed that at the joint session of the chambers, in our chamber and at the congress a motion was made that one of the deputies be a woman. We are now examining this question. So, please, do you have a question?

From the floor: Just a comment. Rafik Nishanovich, when you were first chosen, you did not answer very clearly and today do not seem to know the procedures well. Let us do things in a human manner. Let us say to what number the number of candidates can be brought? Are there enough candidates? There are. But you do not do this.

R.N. Nishanov: Three candidates have been proposed and we will vote further.

From the floor: Let us set a limit. Should there be three or five?

R.N. Nishanov: That was just what I wanted to propose voting on setting a limit.

From the floor: We feel that we must not hurry on this question. And I agree with the comrade who spoke here first. You have informed us incorrectly. We are all living persons and we heard Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev appeal...you have directed us, you have released some 20 persons so that you could be there, instill order and help. I feel that from the very outset you must keep your word. And the decision of the Supreme Soviet must be carried out.

From the floor: But we are carrying it out.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please, you have a proposal?

From the floor: I would like to lodge a protest. I would request that we not speak about the difficult situation which has arisen in our republic, without knowing the heart of the matter. This merely worsens the atmosphere. For this reason I appeal to you. Comrade deputies, this is the second time that I appeal to you: stop stirring up this question. The 25 deputies from Uzbekistan were there and they have flown off again. Rafik Nishanovich was also there. We must not speculate with this major question. (Applause). **R.N. Nishanov:** Please, Comrade Pogosyan. **G.A. Pogosyan,** pensioner (Stepanakert National-Territorial Electoral District): Respected deputies! I feel that it is precisely the moment when we in no instance should hurry, rush or "by acclaim" choose and promote the leaders of our commissions, the deputy chairmen of the chamber and so forth. We must measure a hundred times and cut once, because if we make a mistake today, then later we will lose significantly more in time, energy and force. We can do something stupid.

I in no instance would belittle the dignity of any deputy. I would like to say that still the degree of competence on interethnic questions here, in our auditorium, shows an enormous difference. This is an extremely delicate and fragile question. In the given instance we should bear in mind that we will clearly have rotation of both the chamber chairman and his deputies. And consequently we must not allow to lose a year of work by the chamber. The person who will assume the post should at the very outset be able to work, that is, he should be competent. Otherwise we will lose a year until the rotation occurs. How can we be so lacking in seriousness? My specific proposal is that I support the candidacy of Comrade Gayer.

I would also like to comment on the speech by the much respected Comrade Azizbekova. I feel (stir in the hall) that the question of Nagorno-Karabakh is so serious that it should be at the center of the congress's attention and not only our chamber. Whether our chamber likes it or not it will be involved in this question. I am certainly not proposing that we be concerned with this today, now. We will not be diverted to this. But we must also not divert the chamber. (Comments from the auditorium, inaudible).

From the floor: I have seen how our leading specialists and scientists here, please forgive the expression, have been unable to provide a competent answer to the questions which were posed for them by our respected colleagues. I have been following closely here and the only recommended candidate is a worker. I feel that she must be given an opportunity to do her work. And when the rotation comes, by that time, I feel, she will be able to answer all our questions. I support her candidacy.

R.N. Nishanov: The proposal has been made to impose a limit on the number of candidacies. There are three candidates...please, Comrade Gayer.

Ye.A. Gayer, science associate from the Institute for History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Far Eastern Division of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok

(Far Eastern National-Territorial Electoral District): This is a very serious moment, forgive me please while I pour a glass of water.

Respected chairman, respected deputies! For me, the proposing of my candidacy for the post of deputy chairman was unexpected just as was my proposal as a candidate people's deputy. When I was proposed as a candidate people's deputy, I was on an expedition in Khabarovsk Kray. For a week, they were looking for me in the expeditions. And they found me almost on the last day when they were voting. The first thing I asked when I was informed of this was who had proposed me. I was told: two Nannai kolkhozes and Dalgeologiya [Far Eastern Geology Administration] of Khabarovsk Kray.

When they told me about this they asked: "Will you run?" Certainly this was unexpected and very serious.... This is important for me so don't interrupt. At that time I said: "Yes, I will run because my people are behind me as well as people who did not know me but proposed me."

Naturally what the comrades have done today is very serious in proposing my candidacy. I thank you and accept the nomination because this was a decision taken without consulting me.... Hence, thanks to the people who proposed me! What else do I want to say? Naturally, in our nation there are complicated nationality relations, nationality policy has been neglected for decades and we must now be very serious in carrying this out. I hold great respect for the candidacy of the worker Vanda Sergeyevna and for this reason please do not take offense with me, Vanda Sergeyevna. I feel that we have serious state questions and possibly there will be rotation. I am not concerned whether I am or am not a deputy today.... When rotation comes, when you have had a chance to get your bearings, then you will certainly be a better deputy. When in a year you have gotten accustomed to the work of that deputy who was elected. But for the first year... Klara Semenovna Khalik has also been proposed. I feel that this candidate is also very serious. I was shaken when I heard her report, when she described everything so soundly—so profoundly does she know the nationality situation in the country.

This is very important, dear comrades. When I spoke at the International Congress in Yugoslavia on the status of our small peoples as well as at a Soviet-French symposium, I felt that the situation of the small peoples was so serious not only in our country but also the aborigines in other states where there are such peoples. For this reason I would like to say that for the first year certainly a specialist ethnographer should be elected, for example, Klara Semenovna. As I said, I will be a candidate. Vanda Sergeyevna, my dear, please don't take offense. I understand well....

One last thing. A comrade took the floor here and said that this should be a person with great tact. You will forgive me for before the major congress I requested forgiveness for my hotheadedness and you all perfectly

realized what caused it. Certainly the 4 million voters in the Far East were watching to see whether I would raise the problems of our small peoples. This is why for 7 days I stewed and requested the floor. I feel that this is not tactless. And the defense of the honor of the Moscow deputies when they were shouted down and not given the floor also depends upon the honor of the deputy. I also do not consider this tactless. Possibly you will again say that I am not right. And again I thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: Please sit down. Three motions have been received. Let us vote calmly. Let us have a normal situation and approach this question...just a minute. You have already asked a question.

From the floor: In our chamber they said that we would be voting separately for a male chairman and for a female chairman as well as for a deputy chairman. The first you have just proposed but the chamber has not resolved this. It is essential that the chamber settle the first and the second.... Two female candidates have already spoken. There is a third candidate....

R.N. Nishanov: Do you want us to propose both deputies at once?

Auditorium: Of course. This must be decided.

R.N. Nishanov: Then let us also give the second candidate and you will choose.

Auditorium: No.

R.N. Nishanov: Not necessary, yes? Good. Then let us vote as the motions have been received. Hence there is a motion to halt the proposals. Who is in favor of this motion, please vote!

From the floor: (Inaudible). For this reason I will not put forward but am putting forward David Kugultinov.

R.N. Nishanov: Good. Wait a minute. Let us record this. Just a minute, comrades. In considering that we must vote and count the votes, I would move that we choose a counting commission in order not to make errors. Approximately by sectors. Each in his own sector will count the votes.

N.N. Engver, leading science associate at the Physics Engineering Institute of the Urals Division of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Izhevsk (Industrialnyy National-Territorial Electoral District, Udmurt ASSR): Rafik Nishanovich, there is a proposal. Since we saw on television how the voting went in the Soviet of the Union, I propose that each sector appoint two counters. Two and if there counts coincide, then accept that. Because what happened during the session of the Soviet of the Union cannot be considered normal.

R.N. Nishanov: Let us agree on the parity principles: each whom we name now will take an assistant. Alright? Agreed.

Do you want to say something? Please.

K.S. Khallik, leading science associate at the Institute for Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Tallinn (Tallinskiy—Mustamyaeskiy Electoral District): Dear colleagues, I would like a second of your attention. I would like to say about myself that I have been in leadership jobs while young, then I led a chair for 10 years and I know what this is and do not want to start with this in my new free role. The only reason why I, after leaving the institute, agreed to somehow bring my life's work to a logical conclusion was the hope that I, as I feel, understand something on this problem and could influence political decisions in this sphere. For this reason I feel that I could be now of the greatest benefit on that commission which can and should begin analyzing the state of nationality relations and nationality policy in our state. If actually in a year or two, God willing good health, it is ascertained that this knowledge and experience should be present behind the desk of the chairman, then we can always do this.

But in this context I have not said, forgive me, the main thing. I am not acting on behalf of the women's party. I consider this for myself, please forgive me, somewhat humiliating. Because as soon as we begin to divide work by the principle of representativeness, this means that we place lower demands on the women than they have grown accustomed to than we would on a normal male worker. That is, this is a male norm for work efficiency minus the female coefficient. We can forgive something, as they say, for the fact that she does not understand or she is unable, is it not so? And so forth. Because she is a woman. For this reason in the given instance I am acting not on behalf of the women's party, not the men's party but simply the labor party. But considering that we for the first time in decades are turning to concrete decisions on the questions of the few or small-numbered peoples, I feel not only symbolically, I feel ethically and correctly that this first experience should be represented in our country by a specialist who knows everything related to the small peoples. This does not mean that one proposal should swallow the other. I have found in the file this paper about Prof Bisher. I feel that could be a very good combination. A highly qualified lawyer, a specialist, an ethnographer and politician who, in truth, has the qualification of historian. I feel that this would be a very successful combination. At least, for the rehearsal. Thank you. I request that I be removed as a candidate.

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

D.N. Kugultinov, writer, chairman of the board of the Kalmyk ASSR Writers' Union, Elista (Iki-Burulskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Kalmyk ASSR): I feel that our great state over the years has endured many calamities due to the fact that people did not step down, regardless of the fact that they were approaching their 70s. And at age 70 they even began to dance a tune in order to remain longer in their post. I could not permit myself this. Furthermore, Rafik Nishanovich did not understand me completely when I said that when we are proposing a candidate for such a crucial post, we must forget about sex. Certainly for choosing a wife, I would

take a woman, I chose a sex. But in all other instances when we were proposing candidates they did not ask whether male or female but proposed as state figures. Thus, I, in order not to increase the number of old persons in our government, if they do exist and do not depart, I hope to set a good example. After I am 70 it will be easier to breathe in all spheres. For this reason I withdraw my candidacy. But the Muscovites have given many good examples. Kazannik, who gave up his seat to Yeltsin, set a good example. As you can see, it was a worthy replacement. I would like to give another name instead of my own. This will be completely unexpected for you: I propose Tufan Minnullin, chairman of the Tatar Writers' Union. Because he is young, intelligent, and while writers do not know everything, they are obliged to be smart. A smart representative of the multimillion Tataria. In the given instance why am I accentuating the multimillion? Certainly we, comrades, have still not abandoned the Stalin-Brezhnev notion which determines what republic can be Union, and what autonomous, who is in a okrug and so forth. Doesn't it seem to any of you that I consider this as a rebuke, a rebuke of the Union republics? Why does not a single representative of a Union republic get up and say: "Comrades! We are 15, and that is good. But let us be 30."

Why such an autonomous republic as Tataria with around 4 million in population and a budget that is much larger than many Union republics, why can't Bashkiria become Union republics? (Applause). The comrades know me rather well. For me the Lithuanians are brothers with whom I spent many years in prison, with representatives of the republic. I know what a fine, spirited people the Latvians are. All the peoples are the same. But when it is a question of who is what, then an autonomous republic is last even here.

I propose Tufan Minnullin, a remarkable Tatar writer.

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

From the floor: I am from the Soviet Women's Committee. I agree fully with Khallik that here it is not a question of the sex criterion. We have merely obliged the Soviet of Nationalities to rise to the level of those complex problems which it will resolve. From this viewpoint, Rafik Nishanovich, I greatly request that you do not encourage our feeling of hopelessness. Today I was watching as all our vain efforts to achieve something, even the slightest change in the initial situation, have actually been reduced to nothing.

When you feel that the situation has matured for voting, then you start up the voting mechanism. I strongly urge you not to do this and not to put the representatives of classes into opposition. This is a profoundly reactionary approach, that is, setting the representatives of the intelligentsia and working class into opposition. Leave the class structure of our society alone, leave our peoples alone, there is no need to create artificial clashes.

I would like to support the motion on the candidacy of Gayer. Why? Because in interethnic matters there are

very many analogues and very many precedents for choosing precisely the representative of a small nation, a small-numbered nation. From this viewpoint we have taken a very fine step, an ethical step, a step corresponding to our level of international prestige, if such a representative were chosen. And she, Gayer, satisfies the criterion of professionalism because she works at the Ethnography Institute. Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrades, now let us move on to voting. This is the last deputy who will speak and then let us agree the motion is looming.

V.V. Gnatyuk, physician at the Kalinovskiy Central Rayon Hospital, Vinnitsa Oblast, Kalinovka (Vinnitsa National-Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): First of all, I would like to thank Klara Khallik for the excellent speech both at the congress and today. I was very touched by her comments. I want, of course, to defend the candidacy of our Vanda Sergeyevna. This is why.

I feel that the combination of such a prominent scientist as Comrade Bisher and the representative of the working class with an excellent natural mind will be very, very beneficial. I should say that I was very fond of the saying which was heard at our congress: "Better a well-tuned mind than a well-stuffed one." I feel that such a combination of scientist and worker will be very well represented in our chamber. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Please, you have the floor.

M.G. Kostenetskaya, writer, Riga (Preylskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Latvia): I want to support the men and the candidacy of Tufan Minnullin. I feel that actually we are choosing a person for a very crucial post and sex should make no difference. Why am I supporting precisely this candidate? I know this person as we were in school together. I can recommend him with full confidence also for his intelligence and as a colleague writer as well as considering his international views.

R.N. Nishanov: Good, please, the next. The last comrade is to speak.

A people's deputy (he did not introduce himself): I also know Tufan well. We were in school together and both are writers. But at present I would like to say literally several words about Yevdokiya Aleksandrovna Gayer. A terrible blizzard was raging at the very north of Kamchatka when I heard her voice. She said: "You realize I cannot reach you because of the blizzard. I want to talk with you, with all the peoples of the North." I went and spoke about this diminutive, bold woman who could be elected the deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. Thank you. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: As we agreed, we will stop here. Yes?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

R.N. Nishanov: Let us vote. Those in favor of halting the proposal of candidates, please vote. Hands down please. Those against? No. Abstentions? No.

The following candidates have been proposed: Deputies Venglovskaya, Gayer, Khallik, Kugultinov, and Minnullin. Of these, two deputies have refused nomination. These are Deputies Khallik and Kugultinov. Shall we agree to the refusal? Let us vote.

Those in favor of accepting the refusal of nomination by Deputy Khallik, please raise your cards. Please put them down. Those against? Five. The refusal of nomination by Deputy Khallik is granted.

Comrade Kugultinov is a very energetic person who referring to his age has requested not to be nominated. Shall we grant this? Yes? Those in favor of granting the refusal of nomination, please vote. Please put your hands down. Those against? Three. Abstentions? None.

Three candidates remain for voting: Comrade Venglovskaya, Comrade Gayer, and Comrade Minnullin. Comrade Minnullin, please come up to the rostrum for a minute and let the comrades have a look.

From the floor: Rafik Nishanovich, I proposed Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin.

T.A. Minnullin, secretary of the board of the USSR Writers' Union (Kukmorskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Tatar ASSR): Comrades! It has been proposed that candidates be put up from the autonomous republics or oblasts, but I did not have myself in mind. It would awkward for me to claim this post, as it was stipulated that a woman should be elected. (Applause). For this reason, I request that my refusal of nomination be accepted in favor of Candidate Gayer. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Comrades! At the council of representatives and the Council of Elders, the question was raised of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. At that time, Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev]—he was chairing the session—said that a conversation had been held between them on the recommendation of Boris Nikolayevich to the post of the chairman of one of the committees. You know what committee this was. I did not put Boris Nikolayevich on the list of candidates because in the council of representatives we were all in agreement. Boris Nikolayevich, please explain this question.

B.N. Yeltsin, (Moscow City National-Territorial Electoral District): In the first place, about the conversation. It was of a very tentative nature and I did not give such agreement since the decision here should be taken by the deputies of the chamber or the Supreme Soviet as a whole. That is the first thing.

Secondly, when I spoke about alternate candidates, I also wanted to put up—and here comrades anticipated me—precisely the candidacy of Comrade Yevdokiya Aleksandrovna Gayer. She has many positive qualities and one of these, aside from those which have already been

mentioned—is an independence of thought, an independence of position which she firmly defends. She is from the Far East, a representative of a small people, and a good specialist. Of course, I do not want to put a worker or a nonworker in opposition to one another. I feel that she will be a worthy deputy. For this reason, I withdraw my candidacy and propose supporting the candidacy of Comrade Gayer. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Two more refusals of nomination have been received—from Comrades Minnullin and Yeltsin. Let us vote. Who is in favor of granting the withdrawal of Deputy Minnullin, please vote. Hands down.

Against? Four deputies are against.

Who is in favor of granting the withdrawal of Comrade Yeltsin, please raise your identification cards.

Please put them down.

Those against? Six persons against.

Abstentions? None.

Thus, two candidates remain for voting: Comrade Venglovskaya and Comrade Gayer. I move that we vote. Those in favor of electing Comrade Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya as the chamber deputy chairman, please vote.

Voices from the floor: We were not counted!

R.N. Nishanov: Just a minute, please count this sector. It is permanently assigned to you.

We are now voting for Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya. A count was not made in one sector and for this reason we are waiting. (Counting of votes underway)

R.N. Nishanov: Who is against? Who abstains?

Comrade Venglovskaya has 117 votes.

Those in favor of electing Deputy Gayer as the deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, please raise your identification card. Please count the votes.

V.A. Ivashko, second secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee (from the CPSU): Respected comrades, in my opinion we have not organized things as we should.

In the first place, the proposing of alternate candidates is in and of itself a correct undertaking and I support this. But why are we proposing candidates for the election of one of the deputy chairmen, although we should have two.

This is a question which we must resolve, that is, we must elect 2 persons so 2 must be chosen perhaps out of 15, or any number of candidates.

Secondly, there is the question that the voting as we currently do it establishes a precedent of inaccurate, incorrect counting. For this reason I feel we must set

rather precise Procedural Rules even to the point of roll-call voting so that "once and for all," literally from the first sessions of our work, we and our electors, all the people are confident that the voting reflects the decisions of the deputies.

R.N. Nishanov: The comment by Deputy Ivashko is accepted. Measures have been taken to provide the appropriate equipment at the following sessions.

A people's deputy (does not identify himself): We have been involved in voting for 17 minutes. If we took the list and read name by name who is "pro" and who is "contra," this would take a little time. Let us do that as it would be easier and more honest, easier to understand who voted for whom.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrades! I can announce the results. None of the candidates received the required number of votes. Comrade Venglovskaya garnered 117 votes and Comrade Gayer 114. So, the candidate deputy chairman will be discussed again later.

Now, let us bring up for discussion the candidacy of the deputy chairman, Comrade Ilmar Olgertovich Bisher. You have his biographic data.

Ilmar Olgertovich, please come to the rostrum.

Shall we hear the biography of Comrade Bisher? No? Any questions? Please.

I.O. Bisher, professor at the P. Stuchka Latvian State University, Riga (Stuchkinskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Latvia): I am always ready to give up this place, if there is any alternate candidate, as I do not particularly seek this position. I would prefer to devote all my energies to working on the committee for the questions of legislation, legality and law and order. For this reason, when they invited me and proposed this post, I reflected an entire day, but agreed in order to resolve those questions of organizing our work and the Procedural Rules which I mentioned from this rostrum at our first session. And the two sessions today convinced me that here there is a great deal that must be done. If I am put up, then my main program would be to devote my energies and knowledge to improving the organization of our work and our Procedural Rules so that our sessions be conducted in a more organized manner and we can more efficiently adopt clearer decisions.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question. Then we will vote.

Yu.K. Sharipov, general director of the S.M. Kirov Ufa Production Association, Ufa (Ufa National-Territorial Electoral District, Bashkir ASSR). Ilmar Olgertovich, I have a question for you. I asked the same question of Comrade Nishanov. You are a lawyer, a doctor of legal sciences and you have great work experience. What is your attitude toward the autonomous republics as concerns their political and economic status?

I.O. Bisher: I would not say that I am a major specialist on the autonomous republics. But I feel that if such a

republic as Tataria or Bashkiria or any other had grown to the level of an Union republic, then I would always be ready to support the turning of it into an Union republic.

Yu.K. Sharipov: Many thanks.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question. Then we will vote because a majority moves that we vote.

From the floor: Greatly respected colleagues, we, as deputies, are all equal and for this reason I never identify myself. But at the given moment I admit that I am a doctor of legal sciences, a professor and a colleague of Ilmar Olgertovich. I want to speak in support of my colleague and draw your attention to the following. It makes no difference what position is held by the chairman, Rafik Nishanov or Ilmar Olgertovich, on a specific nationality question or on a specific nationality problem. These people should be, in the first place, experienced leaders of meetings and, secondly, persons who know and respect the Constitution and, thirdly, in their soul are convinced democrats.

The colleagues of Ilmar Olgertovich from Latvia, if he is elected the deputy, will endure a loss as it will be very difficult, because of his positions, to defend the positions of our republic. But I assure you that we will all gain because he is a lawyer, a professional and a democrat. More is not required.

Thank you, Ilmar Olgertovich, that you did not refuse nomination. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: Comrades, shall we vote? Yes?

From the auditorium: Yes!

R.N. Nishanov: All in favor?

From the auditorium: Yes!

R.N. Nishanov: So, let's as everyone requests a vote. Please sit down, Ilmar Olgertovich.

From the floor: I cannot vote without stating my candidate's position on a very serious problem for us. Please forgive me, comrades, but we have agreed that as long as there are questions, an opportunity should be provided to ascertain positions.

I have great respect for the colleague from Latvia, but I want to know whether you will be on the side of the defenders of the economic independence of autonomous republics? I strongly favor your idea of making the Union and autonomous republics equal in political rights. But after this we must introduce territorial cost accounting as you conceive this. If you support this, I will vote for you; if not, then no.

I.O. Bisher: Yes, yes, yes....

From the floor: Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrades, please do not put the candidates in a difficult position. This is not in the spirit of democracy and is not in the spirit of parliamentary debate.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

I.O. Bisher: No, I will reply.

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

I.O. Bisher: When we were discussing the candidacy of Rafik Nishanovich I had already said that I felt that the viewpoint of the speaker of the parliament or the chamber chairman should be his own but he would not impose his viewpoint on others. And I promise you that if my viewpoint differs from the opinion of a majority of the deputies, I will not force it. That is the only thing I can promise.

R.N. Nishanov: Thank you. Shall we vote?

In the auditorium: Yes!

R.N. Nishanov: A majority vote is required. Comrades, let us vote. Who is in favor of electing Comrade Bisher....

From the floor: Why are we deprived of an opportunity to ask elementary questions?

R.N. Nishanov: If the comrades demand, then I will provide an opportunity. Please ask your question.

From the floor: Ilmar Olgertovich, I must say that I remain very dissatisfied with the reply which you gave the representative from the autonomous republic. Judging from your answer, you said that everything would depend upon whether an autonomous republic had grown up to a Union. What does this mean? Does this mean that you share the Stalinist notion that, for instance, republics differ in size or whether they are on the outskirts or in the heartland? What does this mean? That is the first thing. Secondly, what is your attitude toward the fundamental principles of Lenin's nationality policy? I have in mind in the given instance the four-tiered structure of the nationality state organization.

I.O. Bisher: I feel that everything depends upon the posing of the question by the republic itself. If a republic feels that it has grown to the level of a Union, then it has the right to raise this question and we will examine it. I feel that it would be wrong by a decision from above to switch any of the autonomous republics into a Union. This is for the people themselves to decide as to how they should join the federation. (Applause).

From the floor: Comrade Bisher, one other question! Do you have a general idea on solving the linguistic problem within the nation and in your republic?

I.O. Bisher: I feel that in my republic this question has already been settled. Our Supreme Soviet has adopted the appropriate law. I am not a deputy to the republic Supreme Soviet and did not vote for this law, but I

respect this decision and feel that it does not infringe on a single nationality living in our republic.

As for the question of the nation, I feel that since we are a multinational state consisting of a series of republics, we cannot have a single state language. Actually, we have today 15 state languages in which all our laws and decrees are promulgated. Unfortunately, only the decrees of the USSR Council of Ministers are not promulgated in them, although the treaty on the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stipulated that the decrees of the Union government would be published in the languages of all republics.

At the same time, I feel it completely natural—and we also defend this—that in federative terms between the different republics as well as the republics and the central bodies, Russian has been used as the official language and it now in our nation has been turned in a natural manner into the main language of intercourse between the nationalities. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: With this we conclude the discussion. Let us vote.

Those in favor of electing Comrade Ilmar Olgertovich Bisher deputy chairman of the chamber, please vote. Will the counters please count (count underway). Those against? Please, make a count. Five persons against. By an absolute majority, Comrade Bisher has been elected deputy chairman of the chamber. (Applause).

Thus, we have elected one deputy and now there is no reason to be concerned. If the chairman is absent, we have a fighting deputy. (Applause).

If you all concur, Ilmar Olgertovich and I will consult and by the autumn session prepare several proposals for another deputy. Or, possibly, in the evening after the joint session we will take a look and prepare proposals? (Stir in the auditorium). Well, we will meet in 10 days and settle the question. Is everyone agreed? Yes? Good!

We need to review one other question on the membership of the commissions. The motions have been sent out to all of you, they have been compiled in a preliminary fashion considering those requests which each deputy voiced, that is, who wanted to serve on what commission.

First of all, the question of electing the Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations. It has been moved that this commission be formed with a membership of 40 persons. It has been recommended that Comrade Georgiy Stanislavovich Tarazevich be proposed as the chairman of the given commission.

Please, Georgiy Stanislavovich.

Will we hear a biography or ask questions? Are there questions, comrades? Please.

From the auditorium: We support him!

R.N. Nishanov: They support, good.

S.V. Angapov, pensioner, Buryat ASSR, Ulan-Ude (from the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Organization): Although the question of the autonomous republics, comrades, has already been raised today, I want to come back to it because this question is very pertinent, and very crucial. I would like to pose it in a broader context. I realize perfectly well that the question of turning an autonomous republic into an Union republic is not a simple question. But I would like to pose it on a different plane. How do you think, is it possible to alter the system of relations between the Union republics, on the one hand, and the autonomous formations, on the other? If yes, then in what areas and on what questions?

G.F. Tarazevich, chairman of the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, Minsk (Molodechnenskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Belorussia): I feel that the independence of the nations and nationalities and their harmonious development of course depends upon their sovereignty. For this reason it is not accidental that so much was said at the congress and today at our session precisely about the sovereignty of the nations and nationalities, about the sovereignty of our nationality formations. Of course, sovereignty depends upon the relationships in our federation, upon the relationships, for instance, of the Union and the republics, upon the relationships of the republics and autonomous republics, and so forth. We know what constitutes sovereignty. This is primarily the question related to administration and socioeconomic development, to the development of the political sphere, culture and so forth. For this reason, in answering your question I would say that we have a very serious problem of providing sovereignty with a real content in all spheres of social life, including providing content for sovereignty in the autonomous republics. I feel that precisely in the same manner that we think about the reallocation of the corresponding functions between the Union and the republics, we must think about a reallocation of functions between the autonomous republics, Union republics and the Union.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

From the floor: I would like to draw attention to one aspect. At present, when we have two very good speakers, it is a matter of the essence of the question. I have the most serious doubts on the proposed candidate. These are related to the fact that we know the attitude of at least a certain portion of the Belorussian leadership to the democratic processes occurring in this republic. This alarms me greatly. I realize that it would be exaggerated to assert here that a Vendee of restructuring would occur in Belorussia. This is pure emotion. But I feel that they have not been drawn out of nothing. And since it is a question of an important candidate—this is not a mere procedural position—then here views do make a difference. In line with this, I would like to make a specific proposal: that we elect Klara Semenovna Khallik to the position of chairman of the Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations.

R.N. Nishanov: What questions?

G.S. Tarazevich: I understand that the comrade deputy who has just spoken had certain specific complaints personally of my candidacy and not as a whole against the republic or the Belorussian people. Is that the case? If that is so, then I would request that the comrade state precisely what complaints he has specifically against my candidacy, personally against me.

From the floor: That was not the question. A new candidate was submitted. I do not expect a reply. Please do not answer.

G.S. Tarazevich: You began your comments precisely with that.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question.

D. Khudonazarov, first secretary of the board of the Tajik Union of Cinematographers, Dushanbe (Khorog National-Territorial Electoral District, Gornyy Badakhshtan Autonomous Oblast, Tajikistan): I welcome the principle proposed by Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] for an alternate candidate and support the motion of putting up Klara Semenovna Khallik as an alternate candidate. I feel that in principle we should first procedurally propose certain candidates and then in a comparison we could work out a unanimous viewpoint.

R.N. Nishanov: Well, that is your affair, we have agreed not to come back to this question. On the basis of consultations, we have made this motion and it is your affair to support it or not. Why do we constantly come back to this?

D. Khudonazarov: I request that Klara Semenovna Khallik be entered as an alternate candidate.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your proposals.

R.K. Odzhiyev, deputy chairman of the Internationalist Cooperative Association, Tajikistan, Dushanbe (from the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League): Georgiy Stanislavovich, if one looks at this problem—and I have in mind interethnic relations—then I feel that the main area where we must look most over the next 5 years—is jointly the Caucasian Region and the Central Asian Region. What are your views on this problem? I have in mind a solution to interethnic relations. Do you have your own view of this region? Certainly the social sphere and so forth are found behind the interethnic relations. That is one question.

The second is further democratization which we have mentioned and the nationality question. What is your view on this question?

G.S. Tarazevich: I feel that interethnic relations in our nation clearly involve not only those problems which currently in the Caucasus and in Central Asia. We live in a large country which is populated by very many nationalities—both large and small. For this reason the task of both the Soviet of Nationalities and that commission which is being reviewed here today is primarily to take an objective and balanced approach to all the problems

1 September 1989

which exist in interethnic relations. And on the basis of world experience, the experience of our science, on the grounds of the experience of all the deputies who represent the Soviet of Nationalities and the Supreme Soviet as well as the congress, in this manner solve these very burning, very acute and very important problems of our life.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, your question.

From the floor: Respected Georgiy Stanislavovich, I have the following question. You are the chairman of the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet. The first question. Are you fluent in Belorussian? The second question. Is it true that on Belorussian territory there are very few or even no schools which instruct the children in Belorussian? A third question. How do the Belorussian people respond to this?

G.S. Tarazevich: As for my mastery of Belorussian, I completed Belorussian school and naturally am fluent in this language. As for Belorussian schools, there truly is the problem of language, a national language, and this is probably the most acute in our republic. In the rural localities a majority of schools is still Belorussian schools, schools with instruction in Belorussian. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the cities. In the cities, a majority of the schools (well, it cannot be said that there are no Belorussian schools) but a majority of schools has instruction in Russian. This is a very alarming problem and it alarms the Belorussians as a whole and me, particularly. We are searching for ways to resolve this problem and this has been particularly active recently.

R.N. Nishanov: Good.

From the floor: Georgiy Stanislavovich, I have several questions. The first question: What do you understand as nationality policy? Is it possible to view interethnic relations in isolation from language, from culture, from the traditions of the peoples who enter into these relations? And what will be the relations of your commission and the commission which will be concerned with the questions of language and culture and which is to be organized independently of this?

G.S. Tarazevich: I would request that you ask fewer questions at once, because it is very difficult to remember everything and answer them distinctly. Let me answer the first part of your questions. As for my understanding of nationality policy? I understand that the nationality policy of our state should provide the equal and free development of all nations and nationalities. All the more in the given period of time when political reform and democratization are actively underway and when clearly the victory of restructuring will depend upon maximum utilization of the creative capabilities of each person, each nation and nationality.

As for interethnic relations and the role of language in interethnic relations, I would pose the question somewhat differently. Of course, the cultural richness of our

Union depends primarily upon the diverse cultures of all the nations and nationalities. For this reason the cultural development of the nations and nationalities means an enrichment of the general culture of our nation. And our interethnic relations will depend largely upon how high a level has been reached by the culture in our society.

R.N. Nishanov: Well, is that it? Please, your question.

From the floor: Four deputies from citizens of Korean nationality were elected to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. However, at present in our Soviet Union there are still persons living of Korean nationality who do not have citizenship. What is your view of this and what can you say on the possibility of creating new national-territorial formations?

G.S. Tarazevich: It is very difficult for me to answer your specific question, because I have not been involved with this problem. But if one were to speak from a viewpoint of life or a philosophical viewpoint, our life is moving swiftly, our life is changing. New phenomena and processes are arising, new problems are arising and they must be resolved, including the problem which you have raised. It is essential to study and analyze this problem, and pose and resolve it in the appropriate manner. We exist for this.

From the floor: Do you allow the possibility of establishing new formations?

G.S. Tarazevich: If there is an objective need for this, of course.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

Ya.Ya. Peters, writer and chairman of the board of the Latvian Writers' Union (Valmiera National-Territorial Electoral District, Latvia): Comrade Tarazevich, if you were elected the chairman of this commission, are you ready to organize sessions of the commission not only here, at the center in Moscow, but, for instance, in the field? If yes, then to what republic would you now send your entire commission?

G.S. Tarazevich: If there were requests from the field and requests from commission members, then certainly yes.

R.N. Nishanov: Good, your question.

From the floor: Our Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations is certainly the most important in the Soviet of Nationalities. You are to be elected to the post of chairman. At the same time, you work as the chairman of the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet and are the deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. How do you intend to combine this third position with that work?

R.N. Nishanov: If we elect him, then Comrade Tarazevich will leave his post. Your question?

From the floor: Respected Deputy Tarazevich, You, as you have already said here, as a member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it seems to us, bear responsibility for those ukases which were recently criticized and the congress to some degree confirmed the unconstitutionality of these ukases. They also violate the constitutional rights of the individual. They were adopted with a flagrant violation of Article 119 of the USSR Constitution. What responsibility did you bear for the adopting of these anti-Constitutional enactments and how do you feel now after the congress to a definite degree confirmed the dubiousness, to put it mildly, of these ukases?

G.S. Tarazevich: In asking this question—and I have in mind that portion which concerns responsibility—you are perfectly aware of the answer to it. For this reason, I feel that this question should not have been asked. As for my attitude toward these ukases, I agree with the congress decision and voted for it.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

From the floor: Georgiy Stanislavovich, in the elections did you have a competitor or did you have a district pre-election meeting in the electoral district?

G.S. Tarazevich: Yes, in the process of the pre-election campaign I did have a competitor but, unfortunately, on the eve of the elections he withdrew. For this reason I was running alone.... This was not because someone forced him. I made a special trip to talk with him and find out why he did this.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

V.Ya. Kalashnikov, director of the Erdem Sovkhoz, Mukhorshiberskiy Rayon (Gusinoye Ozero National-Territorial Electoral District, Buryat ASSR): I have a question more for you, Rafik Nishanovich. It still seems to me that if we propose a candidate, we should name the person immediately and we should agree whether an alternate is required. And we think there should be two. Why is Georgiy Stanislavovich answering all these questions now? It seems to me that there should be a second or third candidate, as many as we want. And then general questions should be asked. Does anyone have an opinion on the given question? I feel that this would be more realistic. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: We are following the established tradition. Please, comrade deputy, your question.

R.P. Rugin, writer and senior educator at the Okrug House of Culture of the Northern Peoples, Salekhard (Yamal-Nenets National-Territorial Electoral District, Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, RSFSR): Georgiy Stanislavovich, a session of the Councils of Elders reviewed the question of the possibility of establishing a subcommission or a sector on the affairs of the Northern nationalities within the given commission, that is, the Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations. The reasons for: The North occupies one-half of

our territory and provides approximately 70 percent of the oil and gas output. The volume of industrial product of just two autonomous okrugs, for instance, the Yamal-Yenets and Khanty-Mansiysk, surpasses the total volume of industrial product, for instance, of several Union republics. But, however, the life of the small nationalities of the North is presently in a terrible state. One example. Over the last 25 years, the life expectancy of the northerners has declined from 61 to 47 years. For this reason, these questions must be settled. What is your attitude on this question?

G.S. Tarazevich: I feel that this question has generally been correctly raised, all the more as in my career I worked around 3 years in Yakutia. This was, in truth, long ago, around 30 years ago, but I know how the Yakuts live, or at least how they lived at that time. I feel that this question is valid.

R.N. Nishanov: Enough questions?

From the floor: Can I ask a question?

R.N. Nishanov: Please.

From the floor: How do you feel, does restructuring have a nationality face?

G.S. Tarazevich: In essence, I have already replied to this question and I feel that the questions of interethnic relations in restructuring are precisely the most important area of it. Of course, restructuring and democracy, to which we are now moving and which we are now building, undoubtedly does have its own nationality aspect.

R.N. Nishanov: Thank you. Hence, here the motion was made....

Voices from the floor: Enough.

R.N. Nishanov: Enough. Are there other candidates? No. There was a motion on the deputy, Comrade Khallik. Do you want to hear her? She has spoken, as you know. Are there any questions for Comrade Khallik?

Voices from the floor: No.

R.N. Nishanov: Who is in favor of limiting the proposal of candidates to this, please raise your identification card. Please put them down. Who is against? There are none against. We will now vote in the order in which the motions were made. Those in favor of electing Comrade Georgiy Stanislavovich Tarazevich as the chairman of the Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations please raise your identification cards. (Count of votes made)

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Tarazevich has gathered 152 votes but since there is a second candidate, we will also vote. Who is in favor of electing the deputy, Comrade Khallik, as the chairman of this commission, please raise your delegate cards. Please count.

(Counting of votes).

Some 75 deputies voted for Comrade Khalik. By a majority of votes, Comrade Georgiy Stanislavovich Tarazevich has been elected the chairman of the Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations. (Applause).

Comrades! Here, on this list we have considered ahead of time the proposals that the comrades have made; later we will consult with all the comrades. At the next session you are to choose the deputies and secretaries of the commission. But if someone wants to move from the other commissions to this commission, we can also take this up. For example, Comrade Soev has submitted a request from one of the deputies to put him on this commission. I feel that we will take up such questions. Approximately one-half of the membership will be from members of the Supreme Soviet and one-half from the people's deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet.

On the election of the Commission on the Questions of the Social and Economic Development of the Union and Autonomous Republics, the Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs of the Soviet of Nationalities. On this question we have also presented you with 40 comrades as candidates. We recommend Comrade Eduardas Yono Vilkas as the commission chairman. Please, Comrade Vilkas. If certain ideas arise along the way, we will take them up. If there are questions, please ask them.

Deputy(he did not introduce himself): Colleague Vilkas, you will head the Commission on Social and Economic Development.... At present, I feel that our okrugs are the most backward in social and economic terms. I feel that representatives of all the okrugs should be on this commission. What do you think?

E.Y. Vilkas, director of the Economics Institute of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, chief scientific secretary of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences (Vilnyuskiy-Leninskiy Territorial Electoral District, Lithuania): A large representation, naturally, is preferable over a small one, but here we must take a look. Will not the commission be too large?

From the floor: And rotation?

E.Y. Vilkas: There will be rotation, that is correct.

R.N. Nishanov: Other questions? Please, your question.

Voice from the floor: Please tell us a little about your experience in solving socioeconomic problems in your republic.

E.Y. Vilkas

- I, it can be said, have virtually no practical experience. I am more a theorist and have been concerned with theory, being at the Institute of Mathematics and Cybernetics, with mathematical economics than actually social and economic problems. Recently, since 1985, at the Economics Institute of the Academy of Sciences, I participated in drawing up an overall plan for the economic independence of the republic.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, Comrade Deputy Ishanov.

Kh. Ishanov, chief engineer of the Turkmenneft [Turkmen Oil] Production Association (Nebit-Dag National-Territorial Electoral District, Turkmenia): Respected colleague, I have the following question. Each region has its own problems. The question of questions for the Central Asian Republics and particularly Turkmenia, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan is the surplus manpower. The threat of unemployment is arising. For example, in the republic of Turkmenia for every 100,000 of the population at present from 6,000 to 7,000 are not employed in the social economy. How do you see a solution to this problem?

E.Y. Vilkas: First of all, the proposals should derive from the republics themselves. I feel that the commission should be concerned with the organizing of economic collaboration and help on social problems. But the main thing, I feel, is that the commission should be concerned with organizing mutually advantageous economic cooperation between the republics. And, naturally, at the initial stage the questions of bringing all the republics under more or less equal starting conditions will be very crucial. In particular, the questions of employing the population relate to such questions.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please.

Voice from the floor: I have the following question. Our autonomous oblasts and autonomous okrugs are inside the oblasts and krays. Do you feel it possible, at the request of the peoples of these oblasts and okrugs themselves, to provide a status of both social and economic independence?

Secondly, I support the previous speaker and feel that while the commission may have to be somewhat larger, it should without fail include representatives of all ten autonomous okrugs.

E.Y. Vilkas: I feel that there is no more universal principle for resolving nationality relations than providing self-determination for them.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please, your question, Comrade Khudaybergenova?

R.M. Khudaybergenova, first secretary of the Khorezm Obkom of the Uzbekistan Communist Party (Khiva National-Territorial Electoral District, Uzbekistan): Comrade Vilkas, I would like to ask the following question: What basic economic indicator would you take in examining the socioeconomic development of the regions? The basic indicator?

E.Y. Vilkas: You are aware that generally things have not gone well with our indicators. Generally in the economy, I feel, there is the universal indicator of what you yourself have earned is yours. This is social justice and on the republic level as well.

R.N. Nishanov: Deputy Valentina Semenovna Shevchenko, please.

V.S. Shevchenko, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet (Kiev Rural National-Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): Please tell us how you envisage regional cost accounting. For example, in 1990, before wholesale prices have been revised between the union republics, a portion of the republics will convert to regional cost accounting and a portion will not. This is one question.

The second, a week ago the All-Union Radio with great enthusiasm announced that a contract had been concluded with an English firm for building a large hospital facility in Yakutia and that our nation would pay the English firm for this in coal and lumber.

The workers, for example, of our republic have viewed this without great enthusiasm. Because we do not have enough coal. And at present there are newly built houses that cannot be used because there is no millwork. What is your view on this question.

E.Y. Vilkas: First on the question of introducing cost accounting in 1990 in the Baltic Republics and the wholesale prices. A step-by-step transition has been planned. A portion of the prices and a portion of the interrepublic trade will remain fixed. So the republics will deliver to the union holdings and will also receive from the union holdings, for example, the same amount as in 1987. Gradually, this share will be reduced and the remainder will switch to free trade. This is the mechanism.

As for the hospital in Yakutia, I feel that if they pay with their own coal and lumber, that is their right to build a hospital at their own expense.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question.

Voice from the floor: Comrade Vilkas, we have had special commissions on languages, but still clearly your commission will run up against this problem. So I would like to ask what is the attitude toward the problem of state languages. Is it necessary to introduce state languages in the union republics and in all the autonomous republics regardless of the size of the indigenous population?

E.Y. Vilkas: This is a question for each republic, and I do not want to decide for them. But if your indigenous language is not threatened by anything, possibly you do not need this status. But if it is threatened, then the status of a state language is still some guarantee against the disappearance of this language, and then it must be introduced.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question and then let us consult.

S.V. Ignatov, chief economist of the Pomozdinskiy Sovkhoz (Ust-Kulomskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Komi ASSR): Respected candidate, which regions of the nation do you think must be given priority

in socioeconomic development considering today's great differences in the standard of living of these populations?

E.Y. Vilkas: I have already said that in principle we must give up this policy where the center divides up everything; initially it confiscates and then divides everything. I have already said that social questions should be resolved on the spot. If we examine the draft law on general principles, there it is provided that these questions are to be turned over to the localities. I merely feel that some of them in a case of a particularly bad situation, will come up before this commission.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question.

G.G. Shtoyk, director of the East Kazakhstan Medical-Chemical Combine of the Kozpolimetall [Kazakh Polymetal] Production Association, Kazakhstan (from the CPSU): I have a very brief question for Comrade Vilkas. I would like to know his viewpoint on the introduction of special monetary units with the introduction of republic cost accounting.

E.Y. Vilkas: If I say that these must be introduced without explaining, then this would be a rather bad reply. I would reply as follows: the plan of introducing republic monetary systems is one of the most realistic ideas for escaping from the financial difficulties in the union.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Gayer, please.

Ye.A. Gayer, science associate at the Institute for History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Far Eastern Division of the USSR Academy of Sciences (Far Eastern National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Respected candidate for the post of chairman of such a serious commission, I would ask you what is your view of the problem of socioeconomic development if on the territory of the indigenous peoples in the Far East and Far North their life depends upon the various ministries.

E.Y. Vilkas: I am inclined against the union ministries and feel that the sectorial union ministries are not needed at all. I feel that those conditions mentioned by the chairman of the Council of Ministers are maturing very quickly to abolish them.

(Stir in the auditorium).

R.N. Nishanov: Please forgive me, but there will be no more proposals...shall we limit ourselves to this? There have been no alternate candidates. All comrades...we simply have no more time. We must now halt and in 15 minutes reassemble for a joint session.

For this reason I want to put Comrade Vilkas to a vote.

E.Y. Vilkas: I would like to say that I have agreed for 1 year.

A. Akayev, vice president of the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences (Naukatskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Kirghiziya): I would like to introduce an alternate candidate, the member of the Soviet of Nationalities and Deputy from Georgia, Valerian Sergeyevich Advadze. I make this motion.

R.N. Nishanov: Well, if we agree now, Comrade Advadze naturally might be elected at the next session.

Voice from the floor: Here he is.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, I see, I see. Possibly he wants to be the deputy in a year, on the leadership, please I am giving you the floor. We have proper regard for you, like all the deputies.

V.S. Advadze: No one asked me and I reject the nomination.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Advadze refuses the nomination and for this reason we will not vote. There are no alternate candidates.

Who is in favor of electing Eduardas Vilkas, deputy from Lithuania, as commission chairman, please raise their identification. Please put them down. Who is against? Please, count.

R.N. Nishanov: Some 22 voted against. By an absolute majority Comrade Vilkas has been elected chairman of the Commission on Questions of Social and Economic Development of the Union and Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs. (Applause).

Comrades! Now we take a break. At 1600 we must reassemble for a joint session. After completing the joint session we will assemble briefly if possible in order to elect the remaining two commissions. If not, we will agree on what procedure we will follow subsequently.

There will now be a break.

(A break).

A.I. Lukyanov: Under the right of first deputy, I will briefly, if possible, conclude your session. It remains for you to elect two chairmen of commissions in the Soviet of Nationalities. The candidacy of Comrade Gennadiy Nikolayevich Kiselev has been proposed as chairman for the Commission on Consumer Goods, Trade, Utility-Household and Other Services for the Public. He is a people's deputy of the USSR, a member of the Supreme Soviet and presently second secretary of the Kirghiz CP Central Committee. You probably know him but all the same please show yourself, Comrade Kiselev. I can only say one thing: he is an experienced worker in this area.

Can we vote?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

A.I. Lukyanov: Who is in favor of electing Comrade Kiselev as the commission chairman, please raise your identification. Please put them down. Who is against?

Who abstains? One, two, three...Deputy Kiselev has been elected commission chairman. (Applause)

The next item for me is very easy. It has been moved that we elect the Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities on Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, Nationality and International Traditions and the Preservation of Historical Heritage. The chairmen of the chambers and many deputies have proposed that Comrade Chingiz Aytmatov be elected the chairman of this commission. (Applause). I should say that he is not here but has gone abroad. We had a long talk with him. He has agreed to this. Can we vote?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

A.I. Lukyanov: Those in favor of the candidate, please raise their identification cards. Please put them down. Who is against? Abstentions? The Soviet of Nationalities has unanimously elected Aytmatov the chairman of this commission. (Applause).

With the session.... (Stir in the auditorium). Please. By the rules just one minute.

T. Kaipbergenov, writer and chairman of the Board of the Karakalpak Writers' Union, Nukus (Khodzheyli National-Territorial Electoral District, Karakalpak ASSR): Comrades, for many years we have preferred to keep silent about nationality problems and this silence has now led to an abscess which cannot be cured by words. By words that we are international, by words that we live in a close, multinational family. The idle talk and twaddle has led to a situation where we have driven the most acute problems inwards. We have spoken about the friendship of peoples, without knowing and without respecting the customs of our neighbors, and we have spoken about internationalism, only while attending overlaid feasts. As a result of all of this, so many unsolved problems have built up which now must be settled immediately. Unfortunately, we do not have in our nation a single printing organ which would raise all these questions and pose acute problems. In this sense I feel without fail we must have an organ of the Supreme Soviet and precisely of the Soviet of Nationalities. I propose establishing a new sociopolitical and literary-artistic journal which would publish articles of a cognitive nature on each large or small nation and in which the representatives of the different peoples could speak about their problems openly and honestly.

At the same time, this journal could also publish the most talented works of modern authors from the national republics and autonomous units. The journal DRUZHBA NARODOV has long been unable to handle all these questions. The new journal would help us better understand one another. In order to respect each other, it is essential first of all to know everyone who is to be your friend. I request that all members of the Soviet of Nationalities support this idea and I propose putting on the agenda of the next session of the Soviet of Nationalities the question of establishing a new publication. This will be the first real step of the Soviet of Nationalities in

solving the very complex questions in the area of nationality relations. As far as I know, there are more than enough specialists in Moscow in the area of interethnic relations. Thank you. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: I feel this is a serious proposal. Let us instruct in the minutes that the chairman of our chamber and two commissions—on interethnic relations and the one which will be led by Comrade Aytmatov—to carefully examine this question and report to the Soviet of Nationalities. Any comments? Approved. With this, the session of the Soviet of Nationalities is declared closed.

Second Joint Sitting of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 12th Convocation

10 June 1989. USSR Supreme Soviet Hall of Sessions in the Kremlin. 1600.

Comrade A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is in the chair.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies! I declare the joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities open.

I would like to inform you that at the two preceding sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers, the bulk of questions relating to the formation of the commissions of the chambers were discussed, and it was agreed that the chambers are guided by the USSR Supreme Soviet standing orders, since these are not contrary to the new edition of the USSR Constitution.

At today's session it is proposed to examine two questions. First, the proposals of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers on the composition of the government. You will remember that the USSR Supreme Soviet instructed Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, who was appointed chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and confirmed in that post by the Congress of People's Deputies, to submit these proposals.

The second question: The election of USSR Supreme Soviet committees.

Any objections to this agenda? Shall we vote? No. Passed.

The floor is given to Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov for his report.

(N.I. Ryzhkov's report is published on page 2). [The translation of the Moscow Television Service in Russian 10 June live broadcast of Ryzhkov's report appeared in the 12 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT Supplement on pages 73-76]

A.I. Lukyanov: Do the deputies have any questions? Go ahead.

From the floor: Nikolay Ivanovich, what is the reason for the absence of an autonomous State Committee for Discoveries and Inventions among the state committees?

Why is it always included within the State Committee for Science and Technology?

N.I. Ryzhkov: There was no State Committee for Discoveries and Inventions in the last government. It was transferred to the State Committee for Science and Technology not just today, but 18 months ago. What was the purpose of this? In our view it is not expedient to have a separate State Committee for Discoveries and Inventions in our country. Because ultimately all inventions and discoveries should be converted and integrated into the national economy. That is why we believe that the State Committee for Science and Technology, which has to pursue a given scientific and technical policy in our country, should be directly concerned with this question, so that through this committee we can ensure that inventions are exploited to the maximum possible degree or at least introduced into the national economy. We believe that the proposed combination will be of more benefit to the national economy than an autonomous body.

A.I. Lukyanov: Your question, please.

From the floor: Nikolay Ivanovich, would you please tell us in more detail what is proposed as regards the union ministries—such as the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry? What are we to have: state concerns, or are we to go to the republics?

N.I. Ryzhkov: In my report to the congress I said, and I now repeat in brief, that we have carried out a reorganization of construction affairs in the country. As of today we have republican construction ministries in 14 republics. Only in the Russian Federation was construction the responsibility of union ministries, which we are also now proposing to hand over to the republics, so that there is an integrated approach to this matter. We have seen over this period that when republican construction organizations have been set up, as a rule construction has gone better.

Now to the question of construction materials. When the reorganization of the structure of management of the construction complex was carried out, construction materials were also handed over to the union republics. The union was left with only a limited proportion of construction materials. These are cement, glass, and slate. Perhaps that is not a complete list, but basically these are the construction materials left for the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry. We do not think there is any need to have a Ministry of Construction Materials today. Construction materials should be as far as possible the concern of the union republics, since construction affairs now rest entirely with them. As for all-union types of construction materials, such as cement, glass, and so forth, in our view the USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs [Gosstroy] could have within its system associations and concerns that would unite particular sectors on a more democratic basis and would, so to speak, be responsible for the production of construction materials. It is also our

opinion that not only should several such amalgamations, concerns, or associations for construction materials be set up within the USSR Gosstroy. We think that we should also isolate from machine building some of the machine building plants that work directly for the construction industry, and transfer them to the USSR Gosstroy system with the status of the aforementioned associations. That is our policy on this matter.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Bronshteyn, please.

M.L. Bronshteyn, faculty chief at Tartu State University (Tartuskiy-Sovetskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]): Nikolay Ivanovich, tell me, do you consider it right to retain in such an important post as first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan] a man who is directly responsible for the grave economic situation in the country and furthermore is basically not a professional, but only an engineer by education and has only been working at the USSR Gosplan since 1982?

N.I. Ryzhkov: I think the personnel of the USSR Government will be discussed in the committees and commissions, and it will be possible to put forward your views there. Let me explain that the new laws are specifically designed not to appoint government personnel immediately, but to allow the opportunity to work on this. But since the question of Comrade Maslyukov has been raised, I should say this. Comrade Maslyukov has very great experience in life. He is indeed a mechanical engineer and has held many posts. You know that he worked at the USSR Gosplan as first deputy chairman, and he also worked as chairman of the military industrial commission, where, of course, he was involved not only with technical questions, but also with economic questions, and recently he has been working as chairman of the USSR Gosplan. I think this man is exceptionally well trained, and I would not wish to put all the blame on Comrade Maslyukov for the fact that the economy is in such a state. In my view Comrade Maslyukov is the man who can do the job at the USSR Gosplan, he has vision and an economic way of thinking, he is very organized. Of course, it is for the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies to decide, but I have expressed my opinion, I have put forward my firm position with regard to Comrade Maslyukov.

A.I. Lukyanov: Go ahead.

Yu.T. Akbarov, truck driver at No 2 Truck Combine, Tashkent City (from Tashkentskiy-Akmal-Ikramovskiy Okrug, Tashkent Oblast): I wish to ask this question. It is well known that there is a motor transport ministry in each republic, but no coordinating center in the union. Therefore the allocation of normatives and everything else is carried out locally, in different ways everywhere, and as a result there is no social justice. Our normatives, for instance, are very low compared with other cities and republics. So would it not be expedient to create a union coordinating center for motor transport?

N.I. Ryzhkov: Let me say that this question was discussed fairly thoroughly a few years ago. Today, we do not consider it expedient to create some kind of new organization, be it a coordinating center or some kind of committee—the title is not important. And the main thing is that this is contrary to the regional policy we have proclaimed today. We say, on the contrary: Let us hand over more to the republics. Let the republics have certain sectors of the national economy in their charge. Today, we do not consider it expedient to transfer motor transport to the center, or, as some comrades here have proposed, river transport, and so forth. This is the prerogative of the republics. These questions, in our view, should be resolved there. You have observed that we are today, on the contrary, transferring light industry to the republics, leaving only a state committee under the USSR Gosplan at the center. I would ask the comrades to observe that this is an unusual proposal, the proposal to set up a state committee under the USSR Gosplan. Why have we done this? I would like to explain this, so that you understand. Of course, in view of the fact that we are handing over light industry to the republics, it would be possible to form a State Committee for Light Industry, but we believe that this would be an intermediate link between the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab] and the union republics. We consulted the union republics at great length on this question, and all formed the united opinion that we should not create some kind of intermediate link with no rights or responsibilities. Therefore, in view of the grave situation in light industry, it is necessary to set up for a certain time—and life will show how long it will be, 5 or 10 years—a committee under the USSR Gosplan, which will be able to use certain resources to boost our light industry in the immediate future.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Velikhov, please go ahead.

Ye.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow City, (from CPSU): Nikolay Ivanovich, considering the acuteness of the situation with regard to the atomic industry, atomic power stations, and other types of accidents, is it expedient to merge two supervisory organs, the State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision and the State Committee for Safety in the Atomic Power Industry? And a second question. What do you think, is it not expedient in the future to somehow transfer the restructuring or modernization of the ministries themselves and their apparatuses to the enterprises themselves which in fact form a partnership for the production of a particular type of product? Then they would be able, since they have a better knowledge of the functions they need, to preserve the necessary ties which exist in these ministries and could at the same time elect a collegium and perhaps even the minister and finance that structure.

From the floor: I have a suggestion, Anatoliy Ivanovich. Taking into account all proposals following Comrade Ryzhkov's speech and the commissions.... We have

already begun to discuss. We will discuss all this still further. (Noise in the auditorium).

A.I. Lukyanov: Forgive me, comrades. I want to say that of course there is no point in discussing this question today (since the Constitution provides for its working through in the commissions). But if there are questions and not whole tirades about why this question is being asked, they can be asked briefly. Please, Deputy Podziruk.

N.I. Ryzhkov: I did not answer Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov about the control organs. In my opinion it has been stated quite unequivocally at the Congress of People's Deputies that we have a very large number of control organs. That was when we were discussing the creation of a USSR People's Control Committee. That is why we think that it is possible to combine control functions for industry as a whole in one organ. That includes mining supervision, atomic supervision, chemical supervision, and so forth. If we embark on the creation of separate committees for the atomic, chemical, mining, and machine building spheres and so forth, we would thus create a very unwieldy control system. That is why in our view a single such organ for controlling industry has a certain logic. Of course, it will include a separate specialist for atomic power and a specialist for, for instance, mining, or chemistry, that is natural.

The second question: I can only voice my own opinions, which are based on an analysis of the trends which are beginning to proceed in the national economy. In my report I have already said that this structure of management accords with the present stage of the economy's development. Only the present stage. It is perfectly obvious that at the next stage there will be a different structure for the management of the national economy. One thing is clear, and that is that those ministries and committees which are now implementing the overall economic regulation of the country's life have of course existed and remain—they are the Ministry of Finance and so forth.

As for sectorial orientation, I have already spoken about it and I shall say a few words more. I believe that there will be fewer and fewer ministries. I think that there will be one path. First, large associations will be created which will unite according to their interests, not as monopolies but according to their interests. And I must inform the deputies that the question is now being worked on of creating on a democratic basis an association for the production of mineral fertilizers. And we support this on the principled plane. I think there will be such an association. The clock and watch industry and other sectors of machine building are thinking about an association now. Therefore, as such associations are created, and as of now they have been created in Leningrad (two intersectorial associations), in Moscow, and in other places, there will of course be fewer and fewer ministries. I think that with time, for instance in the case of machine building, a State Committee for

Machine Building will emerge which will have charge only of certain regulating processes. But that is a process for the future.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please go ahead.

Voice from the floor: Nikolay Ivanovich, I have the following question for you. We know the negative role of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources but surely it has surfaced again here. How to explain this?

And another thing: We have too many ministries—civil aviation, railroads.... Again there will be cross shipments. Would it not be better to unite them and make a Ministry of Transport and Shipments? This question is a very serious one.

N.I. Ryzhkov: The first question: I ask you to draw attention to the fact that a proposal is being submitted not for the conservation of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources but for a contracting ministry of water resources construction. We have studied this question very attentively and consulted with all the union republics. There were proposals to eliminate this ministry altogether. But the unanimous opinion was that the industry which has been created in this ministry should be preserved but that in the future matters should be conducted intelligently. This ministry will not engage in water policy, we are taking these rights away from it. It will be a construction ministry, a contracting ministry. The USSR State Planning Committee will be concerned with large-scale water policy. The republics, oblasts, and so forth will take part in this work. The clients will be collective farms [kolkhozes], state farms [sovkhozes], union republics, and others. So that this is an absolutely different ministry, a contracting ministry without any other functions.

As for the creation of a single transport ministry, we believe this cannot be done. The Ministry of Railroads is so ramified and so complex and bears such a load in the sphere of the development of the economy and the people's social life that today uniting, for instance, the Ministry of Civil Aviation and the Ministry of Railroads would in our view only be harmful. We would then have to unite the river fleet and motorized facilities. But is it possible to keep track of all these currents from the center? I think that the root of the evil lies not in the fact that there will be two ministries but in the fact that for decades the proclaimed specialization of the national economy has led to the point where each ministry has created its own bases or its own production facilities in various parts of the Soviet Union and we are now advancing toward each other. It is here that we should seek the roots.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please wait, comrades. This is out of order.

V.A. Karochev, chairman of the "Put Lenina" kolkhoz, Volzhskiy Rayon (Zvenigovskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Mari Autonomous Soviet Socialist

Republic [ASSR]: Comrade deputies! Today we have been presented with the list of USSR ministers. I say nothing about the committees. It is the country's supreme executive organ. The document which I have and which you all have covers all sectors. I repeat: all sectors except agriculture. I have not found the word "agriculture." That attests to the fact that once again agriculture will be an outcast and there will be no one designated to defend it. Once again the result will be that everyone and yet no one in particular will be concerned with agriculture. Nikolay Ivanovich, I have a question for you: Who in our government will be concerned with agriculture?

N.I. Ryzhkov: I have spoken about this, and I want to remind you once again that in accordance with the decision of the CPSU Central Committee March plenum, which examined the whole package of questions of the agroindustrial complex, it has been decided that the union republics should primarily be concerned with questions of agriculture. That is the first point.

Second: There are a number of problems that must be resolved in the center. These are questions of scientific and technical progress, interrepublican shipments, procurements, and many other functions including training and so forth. To implement coordination measures, a state commission for food and procurements is being created under the Council of Ministers as a permanent organ of the Council of Ministers. It is headed by a first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. This organ should exercise the functions which it is proposed that the center should exercise. As for production activity, we have had experience of the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee that we all criticized very strongly for the fact that it would order people when to sow and when to harvest. That is why it is necessary that the peasants should decide these questions, that these questions should be decided locally.

A.O. Lukyanov: Please go ahead.

Ya.P. Lutsans, chairman of the "Komunars" kolkhoz-agricultural combine, Limbzhskiy Rayon (Limbzhskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): Nikolay Ivanovich, agricultural workers are very perturbed by the question of the quality of agricultural equipment. It is extremely low and is therefore one of the disasters of agriculture. Is it not possible to invent a ministry which could nonetheless provide agriculture with machinery of normal quality?

N.I. Ryzhkov: I think that even a supernatural ministry cannot ensure quality. We must evidently find economic and other levels making it possible eventually to produce normal agricultural equipment. We are pursuing a policy to ensure that ministries perform the minimum of operational activity and do not usurp the enterprises. I agree with you that we must find specific levers to improve the quality of equipment. But it is hardly worth thinking that if the ministry issues an instruction then a combine will be better. We must act differently. There must be a high

degree of exactingness on the part of the client, there must be no monopolism. There is a very large number of levers of all kinds to resolve this problem.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please, you have another question?

Ya.P. Lutsans: I have an addition to this question, because the reply was not very complete. How do we explain the considerable increase in prices which has occurred recently although there has been no improvement in quality?

N.I. Ryzhkov: With regard to prices we must obviously conduct a separate investigation. Perhaps I will not be giving an expert answer, but the point is that all these increments passed on to agriculture have mostly gone to loss-making enterprises. And that is why a large proportion of what has gone into purchase prices has been assigned to solvent enterprises. If necessary, let us look at this problem separately. Today Comrade Murakhovskiy is still performing his duties and we will ask him to give an answer. Prices are growing. I agree with you, we must stop the growth of prices.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Shapovalenko.

V.A. Shapovalenko, chief of the Volga-Urals Scientific Research and Planning Institute laboratory for the extraction and processing of hydrogen sulfide gases from the "Orenburggazprom" production association, Orenburg City (Orenburgskiy City Territorial Electoral Okrug, Orenburg Oblast): Nikolay Ivanovich, you probably know that protests against the Minbioprom [presumably Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry] are under way in many regions of the country. Representatives of many scientific conferences and the public believe that one cannot offer the same role to poisoner and physician: The pharmacological orientation which has been assigned to that ministry and what they do to poison people. After all few ministers have been honored, so to speak, as Bykov has. After all, a disease—"Bykov's disease"—has been named for Bykov in Kirishi. Everything remains unchanged in Kremenchug, Angarsk, and Kirishi. That means that either the Council of Ministers is failing to consider public opinion or there is something else.

And a second question. There is a new USSR Ministry of the Oil and Gas Industry. Comrade Bogomyakov has been proposed. How did you operate when you selected his candidacy? He worked 10 years in the Ministry of Geology and for 2 years as department chief in the oil and gas industry and for 20 years as a first secretary. I work in the gas industry. I am sure that Comrade Bykov will be approved. But I consider it my duty to ask: How long will we appoint ministers who have made a mess of their work? The entire oblast expressed distrust in him and did not elect him, although he was the only Supreme Soviet candidate. And now you are appointing him minister. And then we wonder why something blows up somewhere in our country. I have been working in the oil and gas industry for 30 years and I know many worthy people who could be ministers.

N.I. Ryzhkov: When you discuss candidacies, give these names. I would ask you, comrades, and comrade chairman, to decide: Either we will begin to discuss the candidacy of each minister now or inasmuch as this is the prerogative of the committees we will give them the opportunity to discuss them freely. The procedure for the discussion of candidacies has been established. If, for instance, Supreme Soviet deputies say for some reason or other that this man is unsuitable then the government will examine the matter and submit another candidacy. In this case I believe discussion is premature. We must consider the matter.

A.I. Lukyanov: I want to say that I have already received notes. We have been occupied with questions and answers to questions for 30 minutes. Nikolay Ivanovich, if you do not object, another 10 minutes and we will be done. Wait a minute, I am sorry. Questions must be only on structure because we will spend a long time discussing the candidacies in the commissions. Be particularly cautious in showing emotions. The discussion is still to come.

N.I. Ryzhkov: Two documents have been submitted for the Supreme Soviet's examination: a draft law and a draft resolution. One contains the structure of the government, the other its personnel.

Voice from the floor: The resolution on Lake Aral was, most regrettably, halfhearted. Some points of this important document do not stand up to criticism.

A.I. Lukyanov: What is your question?

Voice from the floor: The government commission on Lake Aral headed by Comrade Izrael and like-minded scientists has misled the government. That is what we think. I head the public committee on problems of Lake Aral and I take responsibility for my words. And again you are nominating Comrade Izrael.

A.I. Lukyanov: We agreed.

Voice from the floor: I submit a proposal: That the chair be given the right to reject questions not connected with the discussion of the drafts submitted.

A.I. Lukyanov: Yes, reject them.

Here is Comrade Bocharov on structure. Please.

M.A. Bocharov, director of the Burtovskiy construction materials combine, Moscow City (Sovetskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow): Yes, on structure. I completely agree that now is neither the place nor the time to discuss the candidacies. So only on structure.

First, Nikolay Ivanovich, what if we were to learn, albeit in draft form, about the functions of the ministries? We have been talking about them a very great deal and for many years yet in general they are not yet being really viewed, these new functions. Mutual relations between enterprises and ministries will naturally be built subject to this.

Second question. About banks. Will banks like the Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development, the Industrial Construction Bank, and so forth remain within the structure of the banking and credit system? Or are they also changing, is the banking system itself changing its structure?

And a last question. I shall not speak of ministries, of mergers, or separation. Many questions could be asked here. But one last question: How long do you think the transitional period will last (purely as a guideline, there can be no precise answer): a year, 2 years, 3 years? Why has this question arisen? Because it is possible to think of uniting ministries, for instance the machine building complex or the transport complex. For instance the Ministry of the Gas Industry, the oil and gas industry. After all it was wonderful when the Ministry of the Gas Industry was in operation (the volumes were small, it is true), when construction questions came within the ministry.

A.I. Lukyanov: We agreed to ask questions briefly.

M.A. Bocharov: Please, those are my questions.

N.I. Ryzhkov: I understand, two questions. The first question is about the ministries' functions. I have spoken briefly about that and I want to say again that as the economic reform deepens, as we work out all elements and deepen the economic reform, the functions of the sectorial ministries will change drastically. They are already changing now and they will change in the future. What should be the main avenues of the future sectorial ministries? First. Of course, they must determine the basic strategic avenues of scientific and technical progress. Second. They must create the economic environment. What is included here will also largely depend on the development of our economic reform. If we reach the point where as of 1991 there will be a single national economic normative for the sector then the ministries' participation in the matter will be insignificant. But if we find that normatives are nonetheless differentiated then they will, willy-nilly, take part in it. So in our view operational activity should be curtailed.

We believe that as wholesale trade develops, and the border line has been set for 1992, our ministries' supply functions will gradually be reduced. I think the development of wholesale trade will largely depend on how rapidly we deregulate our market, including the market in production, and bring money and material resources into line. Those are, approximately, the avenues of work which the sectorial ministries will have.

As for the banking system, the document which has been issued to you states that the government includes just one bank—the USSR State Bank. Specialized banks will not belong to the government system. You know about several specialized banks. Our firm opinion is that alongside specialized banks a large quantity of all kinds of banks—sectorial, cooperative, and other banks—should and will be created. Our opinion may perhaps differ from the opinions of some comrades who say that it used to be very good but that then we created 5 banks

and things turned bad. We must have more banks and enable every enterprise to turn to the bank it deems necessary and not to attach it to a particular bank. A state bank is needed. We cannot do without it. It is the chief bank which regulates our country's entire economic life, credit policy, monetary policy, and so forth. It should be woven into the economic fabric of our national economy.

B.N. Yeltsin (Moscow City national-territorial electoral okrug): Two questions, Nikolay Ivanovich. First question. Some 13 deputies have been proposed—that is a lot, of course. But I should like to know who will be concerned with questions of capital construction?

N.I. Ryzhkov: We are now transferring to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] the four union ministries which engaged in capital construction and work in the RSFSR and were formerly subordinated to the USSR State Construction Committee [Gostroy] (two in the European part and two in Siberia and the Far East). We believe that the Gostroy should undergo changes, that its functions should be fundamentally reviewed. We believe that there is no need to have a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers there, the USSR should (we are proposing) be headed by a USSR minister. A specific person has been proposed—Comrade V.M. Serov from Gosplan.

N.N. Yeltsin: Does that mean that the Gostroy will have no managerial or production functions?

N.I. Ryzhkov: Yes.

B.N. Yeltsin: And there will be no deputy for construction?

N.I. Ryzhkov: No, there will not. There will be a USSR minister who should be concerned with coordination, scientific and technical process, and the development of economic mechanisms. And at the same time he must to some degree coordinate the activity of the specialized ministries: the Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, the Ministry of Transport Construction, and so forth.

A.I. Lukyanov: So, a brief question, please.

From the floor: A group of delegates have consulted among themselves. Because many committees are being established for us today and every people's deputy can take part in any commission, we have the following three proposals: First, the structure of the government should be discussed in the committee for economic reforms, where anyone who wants to will ask questions; second, the ministers must be heard in the relevant committees and commissions; and third, we should now take heed of Nikolay Ivanovich's proposal and halt the debates. We are wasting time.

N.I. Ryzhkov: I think that would be the most correct decision.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Revenko.

G.I. Revenko, first secretary of the Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee (Belotserkovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Kiev Oblast): Be so good as to answer the following question, Nikolay Ivanovich: Will the government commission for the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station be retained in the proposed structure and if not why not?

N.I. Ryzhkov: At present the government commission belongs to the bureau for fuel power. Our opinion is that if the Supreme Soviet supports the government structure which I have proposed today (and we believe that the problems of those painful spots which exist today—Chernobyl, Armenia, and a number of other places where work has to be done—should be resolved in a state commission for emergency situations) that commission should also have control in Chernobyl. That is our opinion.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, let us agree: two more questions and we will restrict ourselves to this. We will then discuss. Agreed? Alright? Well, please. The floor is yours, briefly.

N.S. Sazonov, secretary of the Kama truck plant automated lathe production facility party committee, Naberezhnyye Chelny City (Naberezhno-Chelnynskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Tatar ASSR): Nikolay Ivanovich, why does the government structure need to have a USSR State Committee for Forests and a USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry?

N.I. Ryzhkov: We believe that we must have them and not because we want more ministries and committees. I shall give you an answer. In our view, uniting the timber industry and forestry is harmful and dangerous. If we put forest utilization and timber consumption into the same hands in a few years we may be in a graver position than we are now in the timber industry. There should be contradictions there, to wit contradictions between industry and those who should protect the forest.

Z.P. Pukhova, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women (from the women's councils united in the Committee of Soviet Women): Nikolay Ivanovich, we have disbanded the State Agro-industrial committee. It used to be concerned, for better or worse, with the production of children's food. There are 5.6 million women with children under the age of 1 in the country and over half of them have no breast milk. The need for children's food is satisfied very, very badly in our country. Who will be concerned for children's food in the country?

N.I. Ryzhkov: Zoya Pavlovna, that question does exist. We have received several letters (from the Ministry of Health and others and, I believe you, too, have sent notes and letters) suggesting that the departments concerned with the production of children's food should not be disbanded and distributed among the republics. For the time being we are keeping this question in a state of suspension, as they call it these days. We must ascertain who will be chairman of the food commission so that we

can discuss this problem together. Without finally resolving it in advance (I ask you not to interpret this as meaning that it has already been finally decided and that it will be so) I shall voice our opinion: The large plants and factories engaged in the production of children's food should nonetheless be kept under the center's control.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, we still have to discuss the question of the composition of the government at the joint sitting. It is proposed that we end questions here. Are there any objections?

A.K. Mukhametzyanov, general director of the V.I. Lenin "Tatneft" Production Association, Almetyevsk City (Almetyevskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Tatar ASSR): I (not only I but also many associations' directors) cannot understand what the Council of Ministers bureaus are doing. I can see that we are also going to have them now, your deputies have been proposed to head the Machine Building Bureau and the Fuel Bureau.

N.I. Ryzhkov: We have in effect two kinds of standing bodies in the Council of Ministers: bureaus (for machine building, fuel, the chemical industry and so on) and state commissions. Experience has shown that the practice of simply having deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers, as was the case 5 years ago, who only worked, say, on special tasks (if there is a question, they resolve it, if not they can "move on") has not proven its worth. That is why we introduced the system of standing bodies a few years ago and we must say that it is these bureaus and state commissions that deliver the goods: They coordinate and link up the work of ministries under their jurisdiction and resolve those issues that crop up in a specific sphere of the economy. In our opinion, this has proved its worth so that is how we should operate. These bureaus are small. They do not involve thousands of people—they contain 70 or 80 people who fully coordinate the activity of a particular sphere.

A.I. Lukyanov: A brief question.

From the floor: Nikolay Ivanovich, given the administrative-management system that in my view exists to this day, how far can you guarantee that the proposed structure of the Council of Ministers will bring about a substantial reduction in the administrative-managerial apparatus? If you can, by what specific (or approximate) figure will it be reduced? Where is it proposed to channel these forces?

N.I. Ryzhkov: We believe that if this system of economic management is adopted, the numerical strength of the ministries must be cut by a minimum of 30 percent.

Voice from the floor: (Inaudible).

N.I. Ryzhkov: What are we to do with the money? (Noise in the auditorium).

I say what are we to do with the money from reducing the managerial apparatus?

From the floor: What about the people?

N.I. Ryzhkov: People? Well, I think money should concern us first. Incidentally, when we submitted the proposal to the congress that minimum pensions should be increased and thus offer at least a little assistance, it was said that we would submit certain proposals to the Supreme Soviet in the near future, including proposals regarding the use of the money gained from the reductions. A word about the people. Some will retire on a pension (admittedly, there are few such people in the ministry apparatus any more), while others will go into production and others into other areas....

A.I. Lukyanov: Last question. Vasily Ivanovich Belov. That is all.

From the floor: I have not been able to get through once and I have been unable to ask my question....

A.I. Lukyanov: We cannot have any more questions! We have already been dealing with these question for 45 minutes now.

V.I. Belov, writer, secretary of the RSFSR Writers Union Board, Vologda City (From the CPSU): Nikolay Ivanovich, I did not like your explanation regarding the Ministry of Water Resources Construction, for instance. Do you not think it would be possible to eliminate this ministry completely and transfer its functions to other ministries or sectors?

N.I. Ryzhkov: I would have liked to submit that proposal. We also argued for a very long time and had consultations, so let the Supreme Soviet resolve this question.

From the floor: Vote on it!

N.I. Ryzhkov: You have 2 weeks, I think there is time to consider everything carefully. When we told certain republics that we were thinking about eliminating the Ministry of Water Resources Construction completely, I must say that many republics categorically rejected this, particularly the Central Asian republics. Comrades, I ask you to tackle this matter in a well-considered fashion before making a decision (that is the Supreme Soviet's job and it may recommend that this ministry is unnecessary). The point is that we will not be able to do without land reclamation all the same, comrades. We must act reasonably and not permit former mistakes. We will not give this ministry any more money—we do not have any. Land must be reclaimed when necessary.

The second thing that I ask you to consider when discussing this and forming your stance is this: We now have a very grave ecological situation in the country. You sensed this at the congress. We examined the question of "The Volga River Basin and the Caspian" recently. Some R2.5 billion have to be assimilated (I may be somewhat mistaken) just to implement the minimum possible water conservation measures and prevent pollution of the Volga. Some R2.5 billion! Mikhail Sergeyevich said in his report that we are only using half

the money that has been earmarked or that enterprises find. When we discussed the question of the Volga basin, we recorded in our decision (the finishing touches are now being put to this document) that maximum use should be made of this ministry. A very powerful base has been created over many years. Maximum use must be made of it not only for agriculture but also, if the capacities exist, for creating antipollution installations for water purification in cities, too, in order to ensure that where there is a shortage of these forces in our country, they tackle this question. In our opinion, reasonable use must be made of the capacities that have been created. Of course, they can be disbanded and handed out, so to speak, to republics and so on. But, I repeat, we must consider things very carefully before making a decision. Especially from the environmental viewpoint.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

N.I. Ryzhkov: A word about the minister.... You have studied our proposals and voiced your proposals.

L.V. Sharin, first secretary of Amur CPSU Oblast Committee [Obkom], Blagoveshchensk City (Belogorskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Amur Oblast): Nikolay Ivanovich, we have two long-term territorial state programs in the USSR: one for the Far East and the other for the Non-Chernozem Zone. I do not know how much the program for the Non-Chernozem Zone costs. The Far East program costs quite a bit more than R300 billion. The program is under no one's jurisdiction, no one is monitoring it. There was talk of creating a Council of Ministers bureau or some other organ to monitor these important programs. I see that they are not provided for within the proposed structure. Will there be any changes? Or will we simply not fulfill the programs?

N.I. Ryzhkov: I believe that it would be—to put it mildly—absolutely excessive to create another bureau under the Council of Ministers. That is why it is my opinion that those people who have a right to do so, including the Gosplan and other state management organs, should deal with the programs. But I do ask you not to forget that we still have the Russian Federation, where there is a Council of Ministers, which must also be involved in great earnest with its regions. I believe that if we create a bureau for every program we will have too unwieldy an economic management system.

A.I. Lukyanov: I think the question is clear. Thank you, Nikolay Ivanovich. I think that is enough. (Noise in the auditorium). Two people, please, and then that is all. Brief questions.

From the floor: Esteemed Nikolay Ivanovich! The question was raised at the congress of rectifying the entry on nationality in our passport. Deputy K. Makhkamov said that changes to the 1974 provision would suffice. Last November Tajik and Uzbek leaders submitted a petition on this to the USSR Council of Ministers. It would seem that there is a positive conclusion. We must not create additional tension. I have a quite alarming cable, which

I do not want to read out here.... But the fact that this question has not been resolved since last November—we are not talking about building a factory!—is in itself....

A.I. Lukyanov: This can be discussed under work procedure.

From the floor: I will give you the cable.

A.I. Lukyanov: Last question please.

Ye.D. Aypin, writer, department chief at the okrug Northern Ethnic Groups' Creative Center, Tyumen Oblast, Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug, Khanty-Mansiysk City (Khanty-Mansiyskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug): My voters have asked a number of questions concerning structure. There are two ministries. The Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry and the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises. There is also a third ministry—the USSR Ministry of Geology. I have a question about their amalgamation. What is your stance on this?

N.I. Ryzhkov: You have noticed that petroleum and gas industry ministries are being amalgamated. As for the Ministry of Geology, we think it should be independent. But we have proposed amalgamating two ministries.

A.I. Lukyanov: Thank you, Nikolay Ivanovich.

Comrade deputies, as we have already mentioned, under Article 123 of the USSR Constitution, officials are to be appointed to the Council of Ministers on the basis of a conclusion drawn by the chambers' relevant standing commissions and the USSR Supreme Soviet committees. So the following Supreme Soviet draft resolution is being submitted for your examination:

First. It is proposed to examine at the USSR Supreme Soviet the proposal put by Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, "On the Structure and Composition of the USSR Council of Ministers."

Second. It is proposed to instruct the relevant USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' standing commissions to submit their findings on the candidacies proposed for appointment to the USSR Council of Ministers under Article 123 of the USSR Constitution.

That is the draft resolution. Are there any comments on it?

Voices from the floor: No.

A.I. Lukyanov: No. I want to speak about structure and composition once again. Under Article 123 of the Constitution, the chambers' committees and commissions submit their findings on the appointment of officials but not on structure. The two chambers will discuss structure jointly. I want to say that the question of structure will be

dealt with at sittings of the standing commissions and the chambers' committees. Are there any other ideas on this resolution?

Voices from the floor: No!

A.I. Lukyanov: Then I ask you to vote on this draft. I put it to the vote—both chambers voting simultaneously. Those in favor of the proposed draft resolutions raise your credentials cards. Lower them. Any against? Two against. Any abstentions.... One abstention. The resolution is passed by a majority.

Comrades, how do we intend to structure our future work on this complex question? The committees and commissions will begin their work next Monday. Not this Monday but next—19 June. They will have 1 week to discuss the candidacies for the government and prepare their findings. The plenary sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers will resume 26 June. At these sittings it is proposed to submit changes to the law "On the USSR Council of Ministers," which you have been given. You have seen it. If the list of ministries is changed and there are quite substantial corrections to be made, the law will have to be changed—in connection with the proposals that Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has submitted on structure and in view of the relevant comments from the Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' standing commissions. Then the Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions will examine the proposals on composition. We still have a People's Control Committee, a Supreme Court, a Prosecutor's Office, and a State Board of Arbitration. Then we will begin our work on draft laws, for which the USSR Supreme Soviet is responsible. Those are the proposals on this question. Are there any comments?

B.N. Yeltsin: Anatoliy Ivanovich, considering that our committees and commissions are on the whole not of a departmental nature but are problem-solving bodies, it will clearly be difficult for a commission to resolve the question of one minister. So we must obviously think in an organized fashion—and have three commissions and two committees meet on a particular candidacy and discuss these candidacies jointly.

A.I. Lukyanov: We will inform the leadership of the commissions, committees, and chambers of these proposals so that they can decide where we are to act jointly, where separately, and where two commissions, say, are to act, and so on, if this turns out to be necessary. Are there any other proposals?

Voices from the floor: No!

A.I. Lukyanov: Then permit me to end this question and move on to the next question on the agenda.

Voices from the floor: (Indistinct).

A.I. Lukyanov: Shall we break somewhat later? Yes.

It is a question of electing the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This question was initially agreed upon

separately, by both chambers, and then at a joint session of the chambers, the chairmen of the Soviet of Union and Soviet of Nationalities were instructed to consult carefully on the question with the deputies, the deputy groups from the republics and regions. Then considering those ideas that were raised by the deputies according to their participation in the committees and commissions, proposals were to be made. Such preliminary work has been already done by the chamber chairmen, Comrades Primakov and Nishanov. In the future, the committee membership will somewhat settle down. On this question permit me to turn the floor over to Comrade Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov.

Ye.M. Primakov: Respected comrade deputies! As was already stated, the chamber chairmen were instructed to work on the organization of the committees. With the agreement of many deputy groups, the appropriate candidates were chosen. Similar work was also carried out with the intended committee leaders. Before announcing the proposed candidates for the post of committee chairmen, I would like to make certain preliminary comments.

In the first place, the comrades realize that approximately 800 persons can work on these committees and commissions of the permanent chambers: around 400 from the Supreme Soviet and 50 percent of the deputies who are not part of the Supreme Soviet. This means another 400 or a total of 800. Roughly speaking, one-third of the entire membership of the people's deputies. On the basis of rotation, the personnel will change and the makeup of these committees will be constantly changing both in terms of size and possibly in terms of quality. Let us start from the view that everyone who proves himself well in the work of the committees will be assigned there. Everyone who merely signs up will depart and be replaced by those who actually want to work. This is my first preliminary comment. The second is that list which was sent out to you for the committees is of a preliminary sort. This is the basis. It will be modified as a result of those proposals which will be made and are already being made. We are considering all proposals within the feasible. Hence, there will be definite moving about, the switching from one committee to another, the adding to of the committee memberships and so forth. For this reason I would request that your discussion now focus on the questions related to the membership of these committees. We will decide this as we go along. At present, we must not be diverted from the more important question of choosing the committee chairmen.

The preliminary talks, discussions and conversations have been held. We have been concerned with this question, naturally, for just several days otherwise you would accuse us of fixing this matter and would say that the preliminary list had already been drawn up and given out to us. This was not the case. For this reason we have reached the following conclusion.

The Committee on International Affairs. It has not been possible now to select a chairman. Obviously, it will be

up to all of us to approve or select a chairman at the next session, at the congress or in line with the work of the following session and congress because then a definite rotation will already exist and clearly certain new candidates will arise.

Committee on Questions of Defense and State Security. When this, as you yourselves understand, very important committee was being examined and where a portion of the deliberations will be conducted behind closed doors—and this practice is well known in all nations of the world without exception—all questions related to defense and state security cannot, as a rule, be discussed openly. For this reason in addition to open sessions—and these undoubtedly will exist—this committee will have a number of closed sessions. This is a natural practice. After long reflection, after debate and so forth we have fixed on the candidacy of Comrade Lapygin. Vladimir Lavrentyevich Lapygin, born 1925, a Russian.

Voices from the floor: (Inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: You should have all of this. What are you looking at?

Comrade Lapygin is a major designer. Very prominent. He works in an area related both to military and civilian production and he understands very well that we must naturally strengthen the defenses of our country and no one should overlook this. At the same time, he understands that a portion of the defense industry should be converted and we must set up the procedures for this conversion. All the available reserves including the basic research, design and so forth in the military area must now be turned over to civil construction in order that we develop our civilian industry and primarily the industry producing the means of production for consumer goods. He has generally agreed to work as the chairman of this committee which, in addition to him, is to include, as you see here, a whole series of scientists—very prominent scientists—who absolutely, we are certain of this, will delve objectively into all these questions and considering the essential maintain the appropriate proportions and considering the essential bring defense expenditures down to reasonable sufficiency in order that the rest can be used chiefly for the development of the civilian sectors.

The Committee on the Questions of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order. Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev has been proposed, a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences and you have heard his speech at the congress. He is one of our leading legal experts, a person whose views are familiar to you now as you heard his speech. I feel that this candidate can also elicit your support.

The Committee on the Questions of the Work of the Soviets, the Development of Administration and Self-Administration. Comrade Nikolay Dmitriyevich Privorov, the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Rostov Oblast Soviet has been proposed. A person who has a very good knowledge of the practical work precisely

of the soviets and is also known for his views which show that he is in favor of a maximum strengthening of local administration and decentralization on this level.

The Committee on the Questions of Economic Reform. We have selected Comrade Valentin Mikhaylovich Vologzhin as the candidate. He is the director of a Lvov plant, and the general director of the Conveyor Production Association imeni 60-Letiye Velikoy Oktyabrskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii. He is known not only for his views which aim at realizing a radical economic reform, but at the same time is implementing a whole series of measures on the practical at his plant and so forth. On this committee we have spoken with many scientists and have decided to strengthen the leadership—that is, recommend.... I want to say that in order to fully observe the democratic nature of the selection of the buros or presidiums or simply the offices, if you wish, for each committee, we have decided (and when I say we have decided I have in mind Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov and myself) to follow the practice of not making a recommendation now—that is, not to recommend to you ahead of time or to any of the committee chairmen—any specific comrades. If you turn to us for advice then we are ready to give it.

Here, on this committee, we are ready, for example, to recommend Comrade Bunich, Comrade Tikhonov and others for the work.

Now let us move on. The Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food. Here, comrades, there has been enormous activity—and I mention this with great satisfaction—on the part of the representatives of the peasantry, agriculture, agrarian policy and so forth. We were faced with the fact that 200 persons wanted to work on this committee. Naturally, we were unable to include so many here, because this would be one-quarter of all the workers on all the committees and commissions. So, dear comrades, agrarian workers, I beg your pardon on behalf of Comrade Nishanov and myself for we were unable to satisfy all the requests here. But let us follow the path of rotation precisely here and use this opportunity to involve a maximum number of persons in this work.

Here we have relied totally on their recommendations: they have recommended Comrade Arkadiy Filimonovich Veprev who now works as the director of the Nazaorvskiy Sovkhoz in Krasnoyarsk Kray. The persons he selects to work with him will depend primarily on him. In speaking with him already it has become clear that he wants to surround himself with many scientists and obviously scientists will work with him on this committee.

On the questions of construction and architecture. This post was offered (the post of chairman) to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin considering his professional specialty and the public figure which he cuts. Obviously, he will be

a good committee chairman who will work hard in this area. He also himself will organize the composition of his assistants.

The Committee on Science, Public Education and Culture. Academician Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhkov has been proposed as the chairman and he is presently the rector of the Ordzhonikidze Moscow Aviation Institute. This person has very great respect in the Academy of Sciences and among specialists. I feel that his candidacy should also be given support.

The Committee on Public Health. Comrade Yuriy Ivanovich Borodin has been proposed, vice president of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and chairman of the Presidium of the Siberian Division of the Academy of Medical Sciences. He has agreed to this post although I must tell you honestly he resisted for a very long time. But we constantly requested his acquiescence because, judging from the responses, judging from his concrete work, judging from the tactfulness which he frequently shows in all he undertakes and, judging from his principledness in approaching many questions—he is precisely the candidate who upon election would obviously work successfully there.

The Committee on the Affairs of Women, Family Protection, Maternity and Childhood. Comrade Valentina Ivanovna Matviyenko has been proposed and she is the current deputy chairman of the Executive Committee of the Leningrad City Soviet. As a recommendation I would like to say that she is one of the few leaders from the city of Leningrad who went through the elections and was supported by the voters and is a person who generally speaking can, in our opinion, do good work here.

The Committee for Veterans and Disabled Persons Affairs. Comrade Nikolay Vasilyevich Bosenko has been proposed and he is the current chairman of the Presidium of the All-Russian War and Labor Veterans Council. Since here the range of work is very great—and is related not only to the veterans but there is also the independent and very large area related to the problems of the disabled, then clearly the committee will be strengthened if N. V. Bosenko feels possible, with several comrades who work on the problems of the disabled and defend their problems. Also subcommittees can be formed in other committees.

The Committee on Youth Affairs. Although, comrades, I want to say that according to its ideology, this committee obviously should not be a committee merely on youth affairs. I do not think that it should to any degree be an extension either of the Central Komsomol Committee or any youth organizations. This is a state committee and on the state level with a state approach to youth affairs. Here we have considered the recommendation which was made to us by the youth organizations and our deputies representing the youth and not only, I want to emphasize, those selected from the Komsomol list but also others. Valeriy Ivanovich Tsybukh has been proposed as the chairman and he is currently the first

secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee. He has very good recommendations as an active person. In a conversation we had with him, he emphasized precisely that he understands that this committee should work precisely in the manner that I have described to you.

Now the Committee on the Questions of Ecology and the Rational Utilization of Natural Resources. Comrade Kakimbek Salykov has been proposed and he is presently first secretary of the Karakalpak Obkom of the Uzbekistan CP. This is a person who has won renown for himself by his unceasing struggle to preserve the Aral. At the same time, he is supported by many of our ecologists and obviously will take on—this is already apparent from talking with him—as deputies many comrades who are presently involved in this area and are very well known for their work but are not members of the USSR Supreme Soviet although they are people's deputies. For this reason, they cannot claim to hold the post of chairman of this committee.

Finally, the Committee on the Questions of Glasnost, Citizen Rights and Appeals. Comrade Vladimir Konstantinovich Foteyev has been proposed. He is presently first secretary of the CPSU Checheno-Ingush Obkom. He comes recommended as a person who could be very useful in this post. In working as the obkom secretary, he has proved to be, according to the responses of comrades, a person who responds sharply to critical alerts and who knows that criticism and self-criticism are the driving force of our society. As the comrades feel, he will be precisely the figure we need. With this, I would like to complete my report. Well, comrades, are there any questions?

A.I. Lukyanov: There is a question, Yevgeniy Maksimovich.

A people's deputy (he did not identify himself): You have said that on 19 June the commissions are to meet and the session of the Supreme Soviet will be later on the 26th. The membership, so to speak, of the committees and commissions was actually chosen by insider methods, judging from some of them. Who will meet then? We have not voted.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, I will answer the question. Prior to 19 June, we will notify those comrades who now are working additionally on one or another committee or one or another commission, or who will move from one committee to another committee or commission. And I feel that they will participate in the discussion which begins on the 19th.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please. No, I want a question first. Please organize.

A people's deputy (he did not identify himself): Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I have a question on the principle of setting up the corresponding committees. In particular, I would like to draw the attention of the deputies to the manner in which the Committee on Questions of

Defense and State Security was organized. I have estimated that a large portion of this committee—19 out of the 38 members—is representatives of the military industrial complex. And we have been offered as a chairman for this committee a clearly expressed representative of this military industrial complex because from the information submitted about Vladimir Lavrentyevich Lapygin, it is clear that he has been involved in the development of weapons. He has received numerous decorations for this. For this reason I would like us to be particularly careful of the principles for organizing the committees and their chairmen so that it does not turn out that on our most important committees we have representatives who are incompetent in the corresponding area or, conversely, are interested in settling questions to the benefit of the personnel.

Ye.M. Primakov: Let me answer your question. In the first place, I would like to say that this list for the staffing of the committees was based upon the requests made by the deputies to work on one or another committee or commission. These were actually the basis. Alright? Each of you signed up for one another committee or commission. Some got on these lists and certain did not for reasons which I have mentioned because it was impossible to include everyone. That was the first thing.

I would also like to say that an adjustment is possible and obviously necessary. Let us not particularly stop on these questions. Let us fill out, let us alter the membership as we go along and so forth.

As for the statements about the military industrial complex, I do not consider them valid. The task of this committee is, on the one hand, naturally, to supervise the executive bodies working in this area and, on the other, to elaborate a legislative policy which, on the one hand, and I want to emphasize this particularly, would ensure the security interests of the Soviet Union, and, on the other, would generally provide supervision so that these interests do not extend beyond the limits of reasonable sufficiency. These are the tasks of this committee.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

E.V. Bichkauskas, investigator for particularly important cases of the Lithuanian Procurator's Office, Vilnius (Shiltutskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Lithuania): I would like to support Deputy Sobchak and say that all the same the membership of the commission is not a secondary question, since obviously it is going to be made public. As for the Committee on Defense and State Security, I have become acquainted with its membership and do not find any representatives from either Lithuania or Estonia here. This possibly could be mistrust of these republics or the first step of demilitarizing the Baltic? I, of course, welcome this, if it is the case.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, I request that no political conclusions be drawn from the specific membership of one or another committee. I feel that here we are including the representatives of republics who by speciality are suitable for this.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please, Deputy Krayko.

A.N. Krayko, section chief at the P.I. Baranov Central Institute for Aviation Motor Building, Moscow (Baumanskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): Yevgeniy Maksimovich, when we had our first separate meeting of the chambers here and Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] was present, I together with the Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Konstantin Vasil'yevich Frolov approached Mikhail Sergeyevich. And as you have understood, we persuaded him that it was not advisable to have science and culture on one committee. Just a very simple example of this: for the theatrical figures, and I have the greatest respect for them, for example, it generally speaking is not important to discuss, let us assume, the questions of developing allocations or building accelerators and vice versa. We seemingly persuaded him that they should be separate. He said that he agreed. Nevertheless, everything has remained as before. Do you find it reasonable to still combine cultural affairs with science? I realize that in some ways they are related.

Ye.M. Primakov: In the first place, I take as a compliment your words that the chambers operate independently—there is one chamber and a second one. Secondly, I would simply like to say to you that of course you are right in posing this question. But what was our reasoning here? At present, we are unable to set up a large number of committees. For now, let us follow the line that on each committee we will set up subcommissions or subcommittees. And later, subsequently, everything is in your hands, comrades. At the next session we could add something or take something away, so to speak, but let us get things started. Let us now not make a matter of special discussion those things which we can rectify in the process of the work having once realized this. Do you understand? Now about your viewpoint. I can tell you that at the Soviet of the Union we discussed the commission which would include transportation, communications and information science. In following your idea, then information science would have to be made separate and so forth. At present, we have resolved to act as follows: to set up a subcommission there. In the future, we will take a look but let us get started with our work. We must now establish committees to begin seriously. I want to emphasize this, seriously and truly to discuss the candidacies of the ministers and the structure, do you understand? Let us make a start. Then we will modify, take out something, so to speak, form something new and so forth. But let us not now get all tied up in this.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please, Deputy Gryazin.

I.N. Gryazin, section head at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Tartu (Pyarnus Rural National-Territorial Electoral District, Estonia): Yevgeniy Maksimovich, we all realize that the very fact of establishing a Committee on the Questions of Defense and State Security is an enormous step forward. This is clear. But there is another question

and that is this committee is not the same as the other committees. I do not have a single personal argument, but I would still like to draw attention to one principle. Do you not plan to remove from the membership of this committee those professional military men who are on active service and who now are working in the military-industrial complex? We, of course, need retired professional military men and if it is a question of special knowledge, the committee could call them in as experts. But the military who are on active military service, in my opinion, should not be members of the committee. This is a committee that exercises civilian supervision over the Army. Thank you. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, then the system for establishing the committees is completely upset. Then people working actively in agriculture should not be included in agriculture, and so forth. (Stir in the auditorium).

I feel that if we elect our military comrades as people's deputies, then they should not be discriminated against on any level. It is another question that we make certain that the military element is not dominant on this committee. This is something else. But to prohibit them from participating in the work I consider simply unconstitutional. (Noise in the hall).

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

A.V. Tsalko, colonel, Moscow Military District (Kalininskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): I as a military man want to draw attention to another aspect of the question and namely that of the servicemen who were elected as an alternate by democratic procedures virtually no one has gotten onto this committee, including myself who requested membership from the officers (more than 20 persons of the 80 servicemen). Trust was shown to two Heroes of the Soviet Union. That is all very good. But without claiming that there be a majority, I feel that there should be professional military personnel on this committee as they could set out the problems of the Army and report on them. Moreover, actually the military should participate in the work. More must be added. In any event, I now make a motion for a self-candidacy: I request that I be included as a member of this committee. Colonel Aleksandr Valerianovich Tsalko, a formation commander.

A.I. Lukyanov: I agree with you on the raising of the question. I agree with you.

A.I. Lukyanov: Wait a minute, Aleksandr Nikolayevich [Krayko], you have already asked a question. Please.

A people's deputy (does not identify himself): I did not want to say anything, but Yevgeniy Maksimovich said that the deputies were distributed to the committees according to their personal request. I suddenly ended up on the Committee on Questions of Glasnost, Civil Rights and Appeals, and I have nothing to do with this. I myself am a war and labor veteran, from the Estonian deputy group. One of our comrades is already there. Is that not a lot from one republic? That is the first thing.

Second, the deputy group from our republic put me up, as is known, for the Committee on Questions of Defense and State Security, considering that I served 47 years in the Army holding various staff and command positions and was involved in teaching activities in the Academy imeni Frunze. I also worked a very long time with new equipment and was the leader of a certain specialty. I was involved in Chernobyl and was also 12 years in civilian work. As you can see the army is involved with the national economy. I could be beneficial for this committee.

Ye.M. Primakov: Good, we must certainly rectify this. I merely want to explain to the comrades that there not be an incorrect impression...

From the floor: (Inaudible).

Ye.M. Primakov: Yes, I agree with you. But I want to explain to the comrades so that there is no suspicion about this. Certain committee and commissions arose after proposals had been made on the candidacies and for this reason there will be a certain regrouping. Later, if the Committee on the Questions of Glasnost, Civil Rights and Appeals does not include many deputies from the Baltic, then I think that there should be complaints of a different sort: not that something has been overdone but underdone.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

A people's deputy (does not identify himself): In the forming of the committees, we, the deputies, were telephoned. In particular, I was phoned and told that so many deputies had signed up for the Committee on the Questions of Defense and State Security that there was no room for me, and we are offering you another committee. And now I learn that this committee included those who did not even agree to work on it. I can give you an example. Some did not agree but were included. In this instance why deceive the deputies? Who would benefit from this?

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, this is not necessary, I beseech you. The work of the Supreme Soviet is actually getting underway now. I greatly request that you refrain from such statements about deceit, supposedly, and so forth. No one is deceiving you. There is no need to constantly elevate certain shortcomings in the work which undoubtedly will occur to the rank of a special deception, if not a provocation. Let us work normally. As for this committee, I want to tell you that it actually should not be so large including, let us assume, 200 persons. You can understand that. On the other hand, the military element on this committee, it seems to me, should not prevail. Some policy should be formed.

T.V. Moshnyaga[m]ed, chief physician at the Republic Clinical Hospital, Kishinev (Kishinevskiy-Leninskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Moldavia): I have a specific proposal on the membership of the Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security. It is essential

that the military-industrial complex be involved in carrying out peaceful tasks, including the manufacturing of medical equipment, medicines, disposable syringes and so forth. The chemical industry of the military-industrial complex is highly developed. For this reason I would like to make a proposal: of course, military specialists should work as part of this committee, but they should not be more than one-third. Consequently, two-thirds should not be military. Thank you.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please. Just ask questions, comrades. We are now not discussing the persons, and I request merely questions.

Voice from the floor: A comment in the form of a question. If one were to note, among the 13 chairmen, only 4 come from the chamber of the Council of Nationalities. And the committees are to be set up on a parity basis.

A.I. Lukyanov: No, they are set up on a parity basis only in terms of size. And here we have representatives from the territorial okrugs, the national territorial okrugs and social organizations.

Ye.M. Primakov: Comrades, there are two viewpoints. One viewpoint has been expressed and this has found many supporters that the main thing now is to select professionals for the work of these committees. Without considering this demarcation. These are committees of the Supreme Soviet. Let us at least act as an united front here.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please. There is another question.

Voice from the floor: A question about this. Please explain what does it mean to organize the committees and adjust their membership as we go along?

Ye.M. Primakov: Let me explain. Probably no one would ever be able and all of us have been working from the very beginning to satisfy the interests of all 2,250 deputies or 2,250 people. A base has to be created. And this base was established referring to those requests which were received, on the basis of the requests, I wish to emphasize, which were received from the deputies. After this work gets under way and as a result of this work adjustments are made and corrections carried out.

Voice from the floor: Who chooses?

Ye.M. Primakov: The technical personnel, following the requests which were submitted. Don't suspect that the committee membership was handed down to us from some superior organizations.

Voice from the floor: I do not suspect anything, but there has been a proposal about this. This was made as a deputy request and proposal directed to the congress Presidium but, unfortunately, it was not made public nor was the proposal for review, although this did come up in the speeches by the deputies at the congress. It is a question of establishing a committee—and here we can give it a name—which would be responsible for selecting the deputies for the commissions and committees and rotating them over the following 5 years so that the questions of

staffing the committees and commissions would depend upon us and not upon this technical personnel.

Ye.M. Primakov: I feel that the existing situation is more progressive. Let me explain why. In the first place, because here consideration will be given to all the opinions of the individual deputies concerning work on one or another committee and as it is possible to satisfy them. Secondly, if one speaks about rotation, this question should be turned over to the committees and commissions themselves. So that no one would impose on them persons from other specially established organizations by rotation. They themselves should see who is working poorly and these should go and who is working well and these should stay.

Voice from the floor: And instead of them, who?

Ye.M. Primakov: Instead of them there would be persons chosen by this same committee from among the people's deputies.

A.I. Lukyanov: Wait just a minute. Please, you have been requesting the floor for a long time.

Voice from the floor: Yevgeniy Mikhaylovich, on the Committee for the Questions of Ecology and the Rational Utilization of Natural Resources if possible there should be representatives from the various regions of our nation. On this committee I cannot detect representatives from Georgia where the ecological problems are acutely felt.

A.I. Lukyanov: Let us put someone on...now, please, Comrade Shevchenko.

V.S. Shevchenko, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, Kiev (Kiev Rural National-Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): Comrades! I want to say that the Ukrainian proposals on the staffing of the commissions and committees have been considered by about 90 percent. And we adopt the proposal of Yevgeniy Maksimovich to make additional adjustments and changes in that membership which is now proposed for the deputies. We are ready to make such adjustments and changes. And I feel this must be done as we go along. This is the first thing.

Second, as for the Committee on Questions of Defense and State Security, I fully share the opinion of the deputies who have made the proposal that considering that the defense industry enterprises should now take an active part in producing consumer goods and aid the national economy, representatives from other sectors should be incorporated in the committee. But we, dear comrades, with all that enormous work which we are carrying out in the area of disarmament and reducing armed forces, must not forget national security and a complete guarantee for our nation's defense capability. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Possibly we should end the questions.

Voice from the auditorium: Yes, a break.

A.I. Lukyanov: I want to say, comrades, that at present a proposal was made here to change the name of the committees and their specialties. Let us respect our own decisions which we have taken. That is the first thing.

Second, a number of motions has been made here which would correct the subcommissions and subcommittees. This is a question for the committees and commissions themselves. I feel that they will act reasonably here.

Third, it was said that certain republics have not been represented somewhere. I would request that these materials be turned over to the chamber chairman and they will review this matter.

Finally, the question has come up that certain deputies want to move to a different commission. This is a possible decision and this must also be turned over to the chamber chairman.

One last thing: No special directives were issued on the membership of the commissions. The congress Presidium, having carefully examined all questions which arose, including those proposals which concerned the establishing of a special committee which would be assigned the forming of the committees, decided, proceeding from world practice, that the Presidium and the chamber chairmen should be very actively involved in setting up the working bodies of the parliaments. We feel that this will also be correct for the future. Because the chamber chairmen who coordinate the work of the commissions and committees cannot be eliminated from the work of their organizing. I would like to simply explain this. Now we can announce a break for 20 minutes and then continue the session in order to conclude this question now.

Voice from the floor: (Inaudible).

A.I. Lukyanov: I will give you the floor after the break.

(Break)

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies, I would like to say that, of course, we are encountering rather major difficulties following this democratic conduct. I will tell you frankly: On the one hand, I am very reticent to take a formal approach to such things and compare candidacies and so forth. But if we do not form these committees now, that is, if we do not designate their heads, then we will have to move this to next week.

Second, I was told today that a number of deputies already have their tickets in their pocket. But we would greatly appreciate it (and I have already set out this plan for you) that the deputies rest a bit, at least a week. For this reason, in no instance urging you to take a formalistic or formal approach, I would strongly request that this session be conducted very tersely, very accurately in the interests of both democracy and time.

We are moving on to approving the committee leaders. First I would like to say that as yet we have no chairman for the Committee on International Affairs and the

chamber chairmen were unable to propose a candidate for us. Clearly we will settle this on 26 June, but its functions here will be somewhat different. Possibly, we will instruct one of the chamber chairmen to conduct the first session of this committee.

Now the next committee is the Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security. Deputy Vladimir Lavrentyevich Lapygin has been recommended as its chairman and he is the general designer at the Scientific-Production Association for Automation and Instrument Building in Moscow. Please, Vladimir Lavrentyevich! What considerations are there? No questions? Can we approve? Do you have questions? I am putting up for vote two questions: One motion is to now elect Comrade Lapygin (all materials have been issued to you) and Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov has told you about Comrade Lapygin; the second motion is to discuss, to begin a discussion of the candidate. Comrades, I request a vote.

Those in favor of beginning to elect the chairman of this committee? Hands down. Who is against? A clear minority.

Then, let us vote. Please.

V.D. Yudin, chief of the Central Geochemical Party from the Central Geophysical Expedition, Northeastern Production Geological Association, Khasyn (Magadan Territorial Electoral District, Magadan Oblast): I move that in the future, when we are to vote on a certain candidate, before this the question be asked: Are there any other proposals on candidates?

A.I. Lukyanov: Yes. And I want to ask....

V.D. Yudin: And in that instance if there has been no opportunity for discussion.

A.I. Lukyanov: Yes. For this reason I ask: Do you have any other proposals?

Voices from the floor: There are.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please, name them.

From the floor: I propose electing as the chairman of this committee a man who is known to the entire world and for this reason it is politically very important that he be the chairman of such a committee and there be confidence in us from this viewpoint. I propose the Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Deputy Velikov. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

Ye.P. Velikov: Comrades, I am very grateful for this but we must not now exaggerate the role of chairman (I am working fine with Lapygin and helping him). I intend to work actively on this committee. (Applause).

Ye.M. Primakov: Thus, comrades, we have already voted for voting on the candidacy of Comrade Lapygin. Those in favor of electing Comrade Lapygin chairman of the

committee, please vote. Hands down. Who is against? We must count. In order to count we must establish certainly a count commission.

From the floor: (Inaudible)

Ye.M. Primakov: Well, there is a clear minority of "nays." Do you insist on a precise count?

Voices from the floor: No.

Ye.M. Primakov: Abstentions? A clear minority. Unless you insist on a count, then it is possible to announce that Vladimir Lavrentyevich Lapygin has been elected chairman. (Applause).

Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev has been proposed as the chairman of the Committee on the Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order. Please, comrades, if you feel that there is no need to discuss this candidacy....

Voices from the floor: No.

Ye.M. Primakov: I put the question to a vote. Who is in favor of Comrade Alekseyev, please raise your deputy cards. Who is against? I do not see anyone against. Who abstains? Four abstentions. We can congratulate Comrade Alekseyev on his election. (Applause).

Nikolay Dmitriyevich Pivovarov has been recommended as the chairman of the Committee on the Questions of the Work of the Soviets and the Development of Administration and Self-Administration. Who would like to ask questions? There is a motion to vote. Anyone against? I am now asking are there any other proposals? Please.

From the floor: Comrade deputies, I propose electing as chairman of this committee a man who has already made a real contribution to this question—Nikolay Ilich Travkin. (Stir in the auditorium).

Ye.M. Primakov: Is Nikolay Ilich Travkin here? Comrades, I want to say that we cannot elect to this post a person who is not a member of the Supreme Soviet. With all respect to Comrade Travkin, I feel that he can work actively as a people's deputy. I propose a vote. Who is in favor of electing Nikolay Dmitriyevich Pivovarov as chairman of the Committee on the Questions of the Work of the Soviets and the Development of Administration and Self-Administration, please vote. Please put your hands down. Who is against? Six deputies. Who abstains? Please raise your candidate cards. By a majority of votes, Deputy Pivovarov has been elected the committee chairman. (Applause)

Valentin Mikhaylovich Vologzhin has been recommended as the chairman of the Committee on the Questions of Economic Reform. Would you please come down here. Are there questions for Valentin Mikhaylovich? No questions. Is there an alternate proposal? No? Then I request a vote. Those in favor of electing Deputy Vologzhin as the chairman of the Committee on the Questions of Economic Reform? Hands down. Who is

against? Three deputies. Abstentions? Fifteen, a clear minority. I would like to congratulate Valentin Mikhaylovich Vologzhin on his election. (Applause).

Arkadiy Filimonovich Veprev has been recommended as the chairman of the Committee on Agrarian Questions and Food. (Applause). Are there questions for Comrade Veprev?

Voices from the floor: No.

Ye.M. Primakov: Is there an alternate proposal?

Voices from the floor: No.

Ye.M. Primakov: Those in favor of the candidacy of Comrade Veprev, please vote. Hands down. Who is against? Two. Abstentions?

One deputy abstains. Comrade Veprev has been elected chairman of the Committee on Agrarian Questions and Food. (Applause).

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has been recommended as the chairman of the Committee on the Questions of Construction and Architecture. (Applause). I feel there is no need to introduce him.

From the floor: There are questions.

Ye.M. Primakov: Please.

From the floor: I have the following question for Boris Nikolayevich. Please tell us, there were several proposals both in the Supreme Soviet and the congress which you clearly have not abandoned but were not approved. How do you presently view the situation and the proposal to work on this committee?

B.N. Yeltsin: I realistically assessed my chances from those proposals and for this reason turned down the nomination. But now, of course, not without some doubt, there are deputies who have confidence that I will work conscientiously. (Applause).

At the same time, I would like to request from the chairman literally 3 minutes, considering that yesterday at the end of the session of the congress it was impossible to speak about the situation which had arisen around the speech of Comrade Zakharov. I would like to state my opinion and possibly continue this question for literally 3 or 4 minutes. Without in any way belittling the importance of the congress itself, without belittling its achievements and political significance on the questions of democratization, glasnost and so forth, I would like nevertheless to say that there was no satisfaction from the congress (it is now over and the first session of the Supreme Soviet is ending). Because many questions which we the deputies (at least, speaking for myself) were expecting were not solved. Motions were not adopted to amend the USSR Constitution and these could have been quickly adopted and then the congress could have worked significantly faster without marking time for 3 days.

Second, a motion was not adopted for there to be an alternate candidate without fail for each candidate in an election.

Third, no motion was adopted on a referendum (if not annually then at least every other year) on the confidence, the national confidence in the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. There were also a number of other questions.... Of course, there was no great satisfaction over the fact that economic and financial measures were not proposed which could lead our country out of the blind alley in a rather short time. There were rather standard reports. For this reason, in leaving, we are not confident that actually in 2 years we will be able to improve the economic and financial situation of our country. I cannot help but say this before you take a decision. Thank you. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Are there any questions, please.

From the floor: There is the motion to begin the vote.

A.I. Lukyanov: But I see there are still questions. Please.

A people's deputy (does not identify himself): From the report at the congress and from the analysis made at the congress, everyone is saying that over the last 3 or 4 years, there has been a sharp rise in incomplete work in capital construction. Will it be possible for the committee which you are to head to influence this over a period of a year or 18 months, that is, to sharply reduce incomplete construction? The money must also be found.

B.N. Yeltsin: I have understood the question and I can reply. It is possible to resolve this question by changing investment policy by legislation.

From the floor: How can we influence preassembled supply for capital construction? Certainly we realize that basically the increased incomplete construction has occurred because the supply of equipment to the construction site has virtually escaped from under any control by the construction workers. How will the committee influence this? At present, for example, at our combine the entire construction site has no supply. Will we influence this or not?

B.N. Yeltsin: Certainly the committee is still not an executive body but rather a legislative and supervisory one. This is the first point. Secondly, my idea, if you heard my comments at the congress, is as follows: so that for the construction workers, in principal, supply exceeds demand, we must reduce the volume of centralized capital investments for industrial construction at least during the first years by 30 percent. And then you will have proper supply, the personnel, the building materials for retail trade, for building garden sheds, dachas, for repairing apartments and so forth. This would mean strengthening the exchange rate of the ruble as it would make it possible to remove approximately 30-40 billion rubles from circulation.

A.I. Lukyanov: Good, clear...do you have a question? Please. (Applause).

V.A. Rogozhina, senior science associate at the Institute of the Earth's Crust at the Siberian Division of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Irkutsk (from the Women's Councils under the Soviet Women's Committee): Respected Boris Nikolayevich, you for many years were the number one person in construction. The bad situation in construction quality in the seismically-active areas was responsible for the secondary destruction of the town of Gazli. Please tell us what measures you, as a person responsible for construction in the state, took in order to improve construction quality in the seismically active regions?

B.N. Yeltsin: In the first place, I was not the first person in construction for long years....

V.A. Rogozhina: Please forgive me, I was looking at the information which we had in the files. You were the secretary for construction on the Central Committee, and then you were the first deputy chairman of the Gosstroy.

B.N. Yeltsin: I was 6 months as the Central Committee secretary and a year on the USSR Gosstroy, and the Gosstroy was split into two parts: the executive, management which was concerned with this entire area with Bibin there, the minister directing it. There was the second part, or the old part of the Gosstroy, which was concerned with standards, construction rules, SNIIP [Construction Standards and Rules], that is, the paperwork which I am not particularly fond of.

V.A. Rogozhina: Forgive me, Boris Nikolayevich, allow me to disagree with you. I am acquainted with the SNIIP which are in effect in construction in the seismically-active areas. Everything is fine in the SNIIP. But things are not fine with the execution of these SNIIP. I feel that a person who was responsible on the Central Committee for construction and then worked on the Construction Committee should certainly pay attention to this. A document which governs construction in particularly dangerous area, in particular those which are subject to disasters, should be carried out without fail. In this context I have a question. Please tell us, if you are elected the committee chairman, and I do not doubt that this will happen, what measures will you take to prevent the repetition of such disasters?

B.N. Yeltsin: In the first place, actually things are not in order in the country from the standpoint of determining seismic activity. When Academician Laverov and I were concerned with analyzing the reasons for the disaster which occurred, we ascertained that even there they had been building using random documents. Let us assume the seismic activity had been set there at 9 points and at the request of the republic it was reduced to 7 points. This was done by someone with a simple decision and so forth. For this reason, having consulted with Comrade Laverov, we agreed that at present together with the republics and, of course, with the geologists and other specialists, we must publish special seismic maps both

on the macro and micro scale for the entire nation. This was the first thing. Secondly, all the standards must be revised. (Stir in the hall). I am answering the question...well, and so forth.

A.I. Lukyanov: Fine, thank you.

V.A. Rogozhina: I allow myself not to agree with your last statement because our maps are in order.

B.N. Yeltsin: In an inspection we learned that those houses which collapsed had been poorly built. In the concrete, for instance, there was only 50 percent of the cement which should have been. The reinforcing rod in this concrete did not hold in the destroyed houses. It could easily be pulled out by hand. Where did this cement come from?

A.I. Lukyanov: Are there any more questions, comrades?

Voices from the floor: No.

A.I. Lukyanov: Sit down please, Boris Nikolayevich.

I, of course, cannot agree with the views which were expressed here about the congress. I feel that the congress was an enormously important event. In order to carry out that program which we have planned there must be an effort by all of us and each deputy although there are valid questions which were raised here by Boris Nikolayevich.

I request those in favor of electing Comrade Yeltsin chairman of the Committee on Construction and Architecture to raise their cards...the deputies of both chambers are to vote....

Who is against? There are five "nays"...

Were there seven "nays"? Then let us count again, who is against? I request a count. Seven persons against. Abstentions? (Count of votes). According to my count, four persons, no, five!

Thus, comrades, by a majority of votes, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has been elected committee chairman. (Applause).

The next candidate, Comrade Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhkov has been proposed as the chairman of the Committee on Science, Public Education and Culture. Do you know him, yes? He is the rector of the Moscow Aviation Institute.

A.I. Lukyanov: Yuriy Alekseyevich, please come down here. Please, do the deputies have any questions for him?

Voices from the floor: No....

A.I. Lukyanov: No, then we will vote. Who is in favor of electing Comrade Ryzhkov, please raise your identification cards.... Please put them down. Who is against? No one. Abstentions? One person...two! Comrade Ryzhkov has been elected committee chairman. (Applause).

The next is the Committee on Protecting Public Health. I would like to say that this is a proposal of the Academy of

Medical Sciences. We support it. This is a very important committee. Comrade Yuriy Ivanovich Borodin has been proposed as its chairman. He is from the Siberian Division of the Academy of Medical Sciences....

Are there questions for him? Please.

Yu.S. Tsavro, department head at the Yalta City Hospital, Yalta (Yalta Territorial Electoral District): Yuriy Ivanovich, please tell us why we have two public health systems in public health? What will be your attitude toward the fourth administration under the USSR Ministry of Health and in the Union republics?

Yu.I. Borodin, chairman of the Presidium of the Siberian Division of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, Novosibirsk (from the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences together with 40 scientific medical societies): I will consider it a part of our public health. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Do you have a question? Please.

V.V. Yakushin, instructor at Secondary Vocational-Technical School No 147, Vitebsk (Vitebsk City National-Territorial Electoral District, Belorussia): Yuriy Ivanovich, I looked at the committee membership and saw that a majority of its members are physicians—that is, attending personnel. Do you plan to include people who are also concerned with preventive work?

Yu.I. Borodin: You are completely right. This is a committee not on public health but for the protection of health. In this regard we will certainly place a very heavy emphasis on the problems of a healthy way of life, recreation, prevention, tourism, and other things. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Are there any other questions, comrades? **No.** Then I request a vote. Who is in favor of electing Comrade Borodin committee chairman, please raise your cards. Who is against? **No.** Abstentions? **One abstention.** Comrade Borodin has been elected committee chairman. (Applause).

The Committee on the Questions of Women, Family Protection, Maternity, and Childhood. Comrade Valentina Ivanovna Matviyenko has been proposed as the chairman. She is an active deputy of our congress. Please come down here, Valentina Ivanovna.... Well, comrades? Any questions? Comrade Likhanov has a question.

A.A. Likhanov, writer and chairman of the Board of the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund, Moscow (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund): What is your opinion on having an autonomous subcommittee on the protection of childhood within this committee?

V.I. Matviyenko, deputy chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet, Leningrad (from the Women's Councils under the Soviet Women's Committee): Albert Anatolyevich [Likhanov], you and I had a sharp discussion of this problem during the first sessions and I would like to make my opinion heard now. I take a positive stance and feel that such a subcommittee should exist, but it should

work as part of the general committee because it is very difficult to separate out the problems of children, the problems of women and maternity. There should be a single committee but within it there should be a subcommittee on childhood.

A.I. Lukyanov: And what then about men?

V.I. Matviyenko: I feel that there should be more men on this committee. There is no need to turn this committee into a women's council. It seems to me that the problem of women is a problem of our entire society and I feel that it would be correct if the male deputies would show a desire and interest in working on this committee. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Boldyrev, do you have a question? Please.

Yu.Yu. Boldyrev, senior engineer at the Central Scientific Research Institute for Ship Electrical Equipment and Engineering, Leningrad (Moskovskiy Territorial Electoral District, Leningrad): The problem is that there was a slight inaccuracy which crept into the comments of Yevgeniy Maksimovich [Primakov]. With all respect for Valentina Ivanovna, I am afraid that the Leningrad voters would shake their heads in disbelief. The problem is that Yevgeniy Maksimovich said that Valentina Ivanovna was one of the few Leningrad leaders to be supported by the voters. In order for everything to be clear and comprehensible, I would request that the respected chairman of the Soviet of the Union clarify: precisely what voters supported Valentina Ivanovna?

V.I. Matviyenko: Yevgeniy Maksimovich said that I was elected by the women's councils under the Soviet Women's Committee. My voters were the women of Leningrad and the women's councils. He said that. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Do you have a question? Please, be brief.

Voice from the floor: You know that in Uzbekistan we have a high proportional amount of employing female labor in agriculture. You probably know the state of ecology and the state of infant and maternal mortality. What does your committee intend to do in the sense of easing their labor and protecting precisely the women mothers in the Central Asian Republics, where the birthrate is high? How do you conceive of your work in this area?

V.I. Matviyenko: I feel that generally the committee should consider the specific features of the republics and regions and you are completely correct in raising the question. I feel that particular attention should be given to the regions of Central Asia and to the status of women in this region: that is, women and children. (Applause).

Voice from the floor: Valentina Ivanovna, what is your view of the 3-year leave for women with the birth of a child?

V.I. Matviyenko: I understand. How do I see the granting of a 3-year leave for women to tend a child? This notion, as far as I know and having carefully followed the

electoral campaign was part of virtually a majority of the programs of the people's deputies. I feel it is our duty and obligation to carry out this demand of the voters. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: May we move on to a vote? Who is in favor of electing Comrade Matviyenko as chairman of the committee, please raise their identification cards? Those against? Are you voting against? Two persons against. Abstentions? Seven persons abstain. Comrade Matviyenko has been elected committee chairman. (Applause).

The Committee on the Affairs of Veterans and Disabled Persons. The motion has been made to elect Comrade Nikolay Vasilyevich Bosenko the chairman of this committee. I am aware that I certainly do not have to say anything in detail about him. He is a person well known in the country. Are there any questions for him, comrades? No? Do you? Please.

Voice from the floor: What do you feel about having very few Afghan veterans on this committee?

N.V. Bosenko, pensioner, Moscow (from the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Organization): Well, I feel that with a desire and the necessity in the final organization of the committee we will include former Afghan veterans in it.

A.I. Lukyanov: Nikolay Vasilyevich, I would also like to support the including of Afghan veterans here.

N.V. Bosenko: They have asked about my age. I was born in 1918. I wish it were not so long ago, but that is the way things are.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Sobchak, please.

A.A. Sobchak: I would like to know which committee you will head? The Committee on the Affairs of Veterans and Disabled Persons of the Supreme Soviet or the Committee of the Supreme Soviet on the Affairs of Disabled Persons and Veterans?

N.V. Bosenko: Since the committees are established by the Supreme Soviet, and this is the prerogative of the two chambers, I feel that this will be the Committee of the Supreme Soviet.

A.A. Sobchak: I understand.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

From the floor: Well, I will not say how many pensioners we are and with each passing year there are more and more. These are difficult matters. In many nations there are ministries on veteran affairs. This committee, of course, is a good and fine undertaking, and a step forward. How do you feel, what is your view of the possibility of establishing a department on veteran affairs? What is your opinion?

N.V. Bosenko: I feel that at present it is enough with that veteran organization which has been organized and is now 3 years old. This organization was set up on volunteer principles. The people work there with energy,

they devote that experience which they have, that drive if it still exists and so forth.... This veteran organization has already begun to work on studying the situation of literally each veteran in all the republics, krays and autonomous republics. And this has given us food for thought in working to improve their situation. At the same time, I want to say that it was precisely the veteran organization which wrote a letter to the congress in order to improve the situation of that portion of the veterans which is over the limit, as we say, of poverty, over the limit of those 78 rubles, although no one has as yet proven this, this is the average limit, so to speak, determining the amount on which one can live.

There is one other question. A ministry. Clearly a ministry now would not settle such questions. It is a good thing that this committee is being established and this is being done at the enormous request of all veterans. I would like to say, you commented that at the congress not only the veterans but a majority of the deputies who spoke made the demand and expressed the desire to help this portion of the veterans.

A.I. Lukyanov: Can we vote?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

A.I. Lukyanov: Those in favor of electing Comrade Bosenko as chairman of the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the Affairs of Veterans and Disabled Persons, please raise their identification cards. Who is against? Who abstains?

Two with the abstaining Nikolay Vasilyevich [Bosenko]. Comrade Bosenko has been elected committee chairman. (Applause).

The Committee on Youth Affairs. Comrade Valeriy Ivanovich Tsybukh has been proposed as chairman; he is the first secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee. Do you know him, comrades? Yes, the youth has unanimously proposed Comrade Tsybukh.

Any questions? No. Let us vote. Those in favor of Comrade Tsybukh? Those against? Three. Abstentions? Two persons abstain. Comrade Tsybukh has been elected the chairman of this committee.

The Committee on the Questions of Ecology and the Rational Utilization of Natural Resources. Comrade Salykov has been proposed as chairman. He is the first secretary of the Karakalpak Obkom of the Uzbekistan CP and chairman of the Public Committee on the Aral. All ecologists have supported him. Do you have any questions for him? Please.

K.A. Kharchenko, major and deputy subunit commander for political affairs, Moscow Military District, Kalinin (Kalinin City Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Comrade Salykov, do you consider it possible and necessary to establish on a priority basis programs for aiding 10 cities (including Zaporozhye which is in this 10),

programs for the improvement of these cities which are now in the zone of ecological disaster?

K. Salykov, first secretary of the Karakalpak Obkom of Uzbekistan Communist Party, Nukus (Turtkul'skiy Territorial Electoral District, Karakalpak ASSR): I feel that possibly there are not 10 but perhaps more cities which should hold a proper place in the ecological program for the entire nation. I will endeavor to take a positive stance to this question, if you elect me, of course.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

V.V. Antanaytis, head of the chair of the Lithuanian Agricultural Academy, Kaunaskiy Rayon, Noreykishkes, Rural Soviet (Kaunaskiy Rural Territorial Electoral District, Lithuania): Ecological questions at present have become the most important on a world scale. Clearly, if we do not resolve them, all the other committees will become unnecessary. Please tell us what meaning you invest in the word ecology?

K. Salykov: I put great meaning in the word ecology. I feel that all the economic and social problems cannot be resolved if we do not solve the ecological problems, if life is not organized in our own home, because things have gone so far. For example, we live around the Aral Sea. The air, the land and the water are all sick. For this reason, the people are sick.

V.V. Antanaytis: Forgive me but you have not answered, I asked what do you understand as ecology?

K. Salykov: By ecology I understand, as I told you, life in our own house—the entire biosphere, the environment inhabited by us, by all mankind.

V.V. Antanaytis: You have not answered a simple student question of what is ecology? Please tell us.

K. Salykov: Do you want me to spell it out? I will tell you. It is a Greek word. It is the home where we live, the environment which we must struggle to improve....

V.V. Antanaytis: Please forgive me, but you are not talking about this. So another question. Please tell us in what ecological problems have you been involved in a solution?

K. Salykov: I have been involved in solving many problems. Basically over the last 5 years they were involved with the problems of the Aral Sea, the rescuing of this zone from desertification and the drying up of the Aral Sea, certainly a disaster for the earth. Major state commissions have been working on these problems, two decrees were passed, and I took a most active part in two cases.

V.V. Antanaytis: Thank you, but you have not answered the main question.

K. Salykov: You of course can be dissatisfied if you wish. Well, ecology is primarily man's attitude toward nature, the environment around him and its protection for himself.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

From the floor: What is your attitude toward ecological questions in the areas of Belorussia and the Ukraine which have suffered since the disaster at the Chernobyl Nuclear Plant?

K. Salykov: I also went through this like all the citizens of our country. But if I am elected and I lead our commission, then of course I will take a closer look at these problems. They are actually frightening. Deputies whom I know and other comrades have asked me to pay particular attention to this. I will endeavor to figure things out and take all the possible maximum measures.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please, Comrade Shcherbak.

Yu.N. Shcherbak, writer and secretary of the Board of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, Kiev (Shevchenkovskiy Territorial Electoral District, the Ukraine): What is your attitude toward collaboration with the Greens and the informal ecological organizations, will you collaborate with them? There are very many of them now in our country. That is the first question. Secondly, what is your opinion of the idea of declaring the day of the disaster at the Chernobyl Nuclear Plant, 25 April, Commemoration and Prevention Day?

K. Salykov: For the first question, I support a pluralism of opinions, as I do all of restructuring and glasnost. I feel that it is not a question of formal or informal. We are all Soviet people. I feel that the opinion of others is the wealth of our motherland and for this reason I take an affirmative stance towards these questions and will endeavor to hear other opinions, to hear and listen to all.

As for the second question, this is a new one for me and I, of course, would support your proposal.

Yu.N. Shcherbak: I will vote for you. Thank you.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Savinykh.

V.P. Savinykh, rector of the Moscow Institute for Geodetic, Aerial Photography and Cartography Engineers, Moscow (Kirovskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Yesterday the ecologists met along with everyone who was interested in resolving important ecological questions. Today we had a look at the lists of candidates for the ecological commission. This list does not have one-half of the persons who were interested in participating in it. These are the persons who fought against the reversing of the northern rivers, who were interested in Baykal and participated in other major projects. What is your opinion that these persons are not found on the list? Certainly when we recommended you as a candidate for the post of the chairman of the ecological commission, you knew these proposals. And if your committee which is now being elected is a legislative committee, then possibly you will take precisely the same stance toward those enactments which will be approved here, that is, you will agree with everything as we go along?

K. Salykov: That is a valid comment. I feel that we must instruct the chamber chairmen and the chairman of the committee to take another thorough look at its membership. I know that the ecologists met yesterday, a number of new ideas came up, and they must all be carried out in the work of this committee. The membership of the committee must not be limited because it is superimportant.

From the spot: One other question. At present, ecological questions can be resolved with space equipment. Supervision can be provided only from space. What is your attitude toward this, how do you intend to obtain the necessary materials, that is, how do you intend to overcome the resistance of the department? I have in mind the veto which the departments have imposed on space information.

K. Salykov: I feel that space information is indispensable. I feel that all the possible information—both domestic, external, international, whatever it is—must be employed. I feel we must set up an information center which would provide us with the necessary materials.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

From the floor: Here at the congress at one time we heard about ecological crime and punishment for it. What is your attitude toward this?

K. Salykov: I take a strict view of ecological crimes. I feel that ecological legislation and law and order must be observed without fail. With the help of Comrade Sukharev, we have set up an environmental-protection procurator's office. The oblast party committee supported the initiative. My understanding of the question consists in such an action.

A.I. Lukyanov: I will give you the floor. Please.

A people's deputy (does not identify himself): Comrades, please forgive me but my voters in six rayons gave me the following instructions.

If I leave without an answer, things will be difficult for me tomorrow.... You know what an influence the Kuban Reservoir has had on Krasnodar Kray. And on the oblasts and rayons which lie around it? So the question is: a similar reservoir is being built at the center of Kabardino-Balkaria. They have already begun work. We have sent letters to the authorities, we have written a letter also to the Supreme Soviet so that the reservoir not be built. I would like to know your opinion. Please reply whether it would be built or not.

K. Salykov: I feel that we must make a study. Certainly it is difficult to reply to all the questions now but I will endeavor to make an investigation and take a positive stance.

I.P. Zelinskiy, rector of the I.I. Mechnikov Odessa State University (Odesskiy-Leninskiy Territorial Electoral District, Odessa Oblast, the Ukraine): We have a serious problem which you will encounter if we elect you

chairman. How to use the Black Sea: as a resort or as a new area for building up the chemical industry and other industrial potential?

K. Salykov: As a resort, of course.

From the floor: Please forgive me, respected Kakimbek: we are saying today that the disaster on the Aral, the disaster on the Volga, the disaster on the Amur and so forth—this list could be continued. But certainly if we do not find a mechanism for solving the ecological problems, we cannot escape from this disaster. Please tell us what you would see as this mechanism?

K. Salykov: Speaking at the congress, Comrade Yablokov pointed out that 20 percent of the nation's population lives in an ecological disaster zone, and 35-40 percent under difficult ecological conditions. I feel that we must first be concerned with these regions, without overlooking those which you named.

From the floor: Possibly the nuclear powers will refuse a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. Will you along with us still demand the abandoning of nuclear weapons testing? This is very important. Even if we remain alone.

K. Salykov: I feel that on this question there is also a position of the party and the government. There is also our general opinion. Yesterday Deputy Suleymenov spoke very well about this. Of course, I will support all that is advanced and new in this area.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, will we ask any more questions?

Voices from the floor: No.

A.I. Lukyanov: We can vote?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

A.I. Lukyanov: Thank you. I request a vote. All those in favor of electing Comrade Salykov chairman of the committee? Who is against?

Twenty-five against. Abstentions? Eight persons abstain. Deputy Salykov has been elected the committee chairman. (Applause). I feel that the chamber chairman will make certain that our best scientists are represented on this committee. This is a very important question for the nation.

The Committee on Questions of Glasnost, Citizen Rights and Appeals. I want to say that this will be a committee which works virtually constantly. It will receive citizens here, in the USSR Supreme Soviet. I have already said that approximately a half million letters a year arrive at the Supreme Soviet. Difficult letters.

Comrade Vladimir Konstantinovich Foteyev has been proposed as committee chairman. He is an obkom secretary, a person who works constantly (I can say this as I know from experience) in the area of nationality

questions in Checheno-Ingush. These are difficult, complicated questions. But he knows this area of work. Shall we vote?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

From the floor: I have a question. Comrades, please excuse me but this is a democratic procedure. Don't rush....

A.I. Lukyanov: Ask the question, please.

From the floor: Vladimir Konstantinovich, the first thing I want to ask is what is your opinion on equalizing the rights of the autonomous and Union republics?

V.K. Foteyev: I would like first of all to set out my views on the work of this completely new committee. It seems to me that at present the task is to turn glasnost into a constantly operating system, a tool by which each citizen would be able to influence the adoption of administrative decisions or supervise them. Finally, I could define my position more actively on this. In order for this to become a system, work must be done not only by the Committee on the Questions of Glasnost, Citizen Rights and Appeals but certainly also by other committees of the Supreme Soviet. We must work on defining a number of political, legal, organizational and other measures. I have in mind the legislative principles or draft laws on the universal discussion of governmental drafts. This would mean referendums, the electing of leaders and, finally, laws on the press, glasnost and so forth. Clearly this is my idea of what the committee's work should consist of.

A.I. Lukyanov: There is a question....

From the floor: Vladimir Konstantinovich, in carrying out the will of the voters, let me ask you: What is your opinion if we, on behalf of the Union and autonomous republics, the autonomous oblasts and national okrugs, proposed declaring 16 June the Day of a National Struggle Against Corruption and the Mafia? (Stir in the auditorium).

V.K. Foteyev: Well, I don't know.... I obviously would not support such a proposal. Because this date is of a very dubious sort. Let us reflect on this and see what the committee thinks. I would argue against.

A.I. Lukyanov: If somebody asked me such a question, I would say we must fight everyday.

V.K. Foteyev: Yes, that's it.

A.I. Lukyanov: Forgive me, Comrade Krutov.

A.N. Krutov, commentator on the Central Television, Moscow (Zagorsk Territorial Electoral District, Moscow Oblast): Please tell us whether you consider it necessary to establish a deputy channel on Central Television? The deputies could exchange opinions here, they could meet with voters and the channel would be subordinate to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

V.K. Foteyev: Well, certainly the Committee should have such opportunities. This proposal, it seems to me, is very interesting and merits attention.

A.I. Lukyanov: Please.

L.I. Batynskaya, editor of the newspaper KRASNOY-ARSKIY KOMSOMOLET, RSFSR, Krasnoyarsk (from the USSR Journalists' Union): Vladimir Konstantinovich, I would like to ask you the following question. I was elected by the USSR Journalists' Union, that is, behind me is an army of many thousands of journalists and for a start I was very surprised that not a single representative of our profession was given the floor at the congress. That is one thing. Secondly, you of course remember, respected Vladimir Konstantinovich, how difficult the organizing of the given committee was. There were disagreements but nevertheless the following formulation was produced: on the questions of glasnost, citizen rights and appeals. Let us assume that as a journalist I understand what I include in the word "glasnost." But what do you as the future committee chairman include in this word? Is there a possibility for each person to sit down and write a letter to this committee or something else?

V.K. Foteyev: You understand that when I was speaking with Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, the question reasonably arose: Who should best head the committee? A lawyer? A journalist? If you recall, at the 19th Party Conference, when the issue arose of a Press Law, two groups of delegates spoke. One said: let us work out a law in order, excuse my frankness, to muzzle the press. The other, on the contrary, stated we will create one in order to protect the press. And clearly the committee was organized (as I understand the chamber chairmen) in such a manner that it would include persons, in the first place, with experience and common sense and, secondly, those who would be able to help in working out legal, legislative and other enactments. This is how I understand this.

A.I. Lukyanov: Is there a motion to vote? I put to vote. Those in favor of electing Comrade Foteyev as committee chairman, I request.... (Stir in the auditorium) Wait a minute, comrades. Let us do as follows: If we are going to continue the questions, then let us vote. Who is in favor of continuing the questions? I request a vote. A minority.

Now let us vote on the candidacy of Comrade Foteyev. So. Who is against? (Counting of votes). Ten against. Who abstains? Ten abstentions.

Comrade Foteyev has been elected committee chairman. (Applause).

Comrades, I have been asked by many to tell about the procedure for further work. In order that there be the greatest clarity. Thus, we have formed the committees and a large portion of the commissions has been formed (with the exception of two commissions in the Soviet of Nationalities). We now propose interrupting the work of our session for a week (until next Monday, the 19th of June). You have received materials on the membership of the government, its structure and so forth. We would like that those comrades who are members of committees (and you will receive the last data about the committees from the chamber chairmen) to arrive here on the 19th so that each of the committees gets to work on the membership of our government and hears the ministers. I feel that this will be very beneficial work. On 26 June, a joint session of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet will meet in order to settle the question of the ratification of our government in its initial membership. Those deputies who are members of the Supreme Soviet but are not members of the commissions can arrive on 26 June if they are not interested in the work of any committee and do not want to hear these questions. (From the auditorium. Inaudible).

A.I. Lukyanov: I repeat again: the commissions and committees. Those who are not members or do not want to come to participate in their work can arrive by the 26th of June. As soon as the government is formed, a whole series of questions will confront you as the congress assigned you to resolve them. According to the first estimates, if we work in an organized manner, this will take approximately a month and 10 days.

Then, at the session (since the membership of the commissions and committees will already be determined as well as the chairmen, the deputy chairmen, the secretaries and leaders of the subcommissions), it will be clear which of the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet will work constantly in Moscow until the rotation. This will be clear only then. That is why we are unable now to answer this question. We are planning that approximately 80 percent of the comrades will work here.

Comrades! I have just spoken with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev by telephone. He sends you greetings and asked that you meet with the voters, describe our congress and the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which will then continue its work in the sessions of the commissions, committees and chambers. Report to them on the entire democratic, as he put it, "fire of the congress." (Applause).

With this the joint session of the chambers was declared closed.